THE Lutheran Quarterly

olume II FEBRUARY, 1950 Number 1

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

v. 2
1950

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume II FEBRUARY, 1950 Number 1

CONTENTS

LUTHERAN SERVICE TO REFUGEES — *Stewart W. Herman* 3

NIHILISM IN EAST AND WEST — *Ernst Benz* 17

DOCTRINE OF MAN IN THE LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS, *Jaroslav Pelikan* 34

LUTHERAN PASTORAL CARE IN AMERICA TODAY, *C. Charles Bachmann* 45

CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM IN THE POETRY OF LA MARTINE, *Gerard C. Hasenauer* 58

LUTHERAN WORLD MISSIONS — *Fredrik A. Schiotz* 64

NOTES AND STUDIES

Exegesis of Ephesians 2:1-7 — *R. H. Reinsche* 70
The Problem of the Two Cups — *J. Knudsen* 74
The American Lutheran Church in California — *George H. Muedeking* 85
National Churches Free From Rome — *Christ und Welt* 92

BOOK REVIEWS

Bonhoeffer, *The Cost of Discipleship* (E. H. Wahlstrom) — 98
Baab, *The Theology of the Old Testament* (C. M. Cooper) — 99
Knox, *Trials of a Translator* (R. T. Stamm) — 101
Horton, *Toward a Reborn Church* (C. Bergendoff) — 102
Newbigin, *The Reunion of the Church* (H. L. Yochum) — 102
Stoltz, *Folkets Röst* (A. D. Mattson) — 103
Kramm, *The Theology of Martin Luther* (A. R. Wentz) — 104
Kettner, *Grossie* (P. H. Buehring) — 105
Latko, *Origen's Concept of Penance* (J. Kuethe) — 106
Phillips, *Bearing Witness to the Truth* (J. A. Dell) — 107
Holman, *Psychology and Religion for Everyday Living* (G. H. Muedeking) — 108
Three Books of Sermons on the Trinity Season (H. F. Baughman) — 110
Force, *My Heart's Desire* (R. D. Lechleitner) — 111
Lornell, *Lift Up Your Hearts!* (A. A. Jagnow) — 111
Kunze, *Das Tuch der Veronika* (A. A. Jagnow) — 111
Cashman, *The Finances of a Church* (H. D. Hoover) — 111
Koepp, *Von hohen Ethos der Brautliebe* (E. W. Matzner) — 112
Morgan, *Man's Restless Search* (G. R. Seltzer) — 113
Weatherhead, *When the Lamp Flickers* (E. E. Flack) — 113
Buber, *The Prophetic Faith* (C. U. Wolf) — 114
Bewer, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets, II* (J. M. Myers) — 115
Beckmann, et al., *Kirchenagende I, Band I* (L. D. Reed) — 115
Blackwood, *Pastoral Leadership* (P. J. Hoh) — 117
Schweitzer, *Memoirs of Childhood and Youth* (O. H. Bostrom) — 118

BOOKS RECEIVED — 119

CONTRIBUTORS — 120

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Office of Publication, Seminary Hill, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly,* founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review,* founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly,* Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, Books for review to the Book Review Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.50 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
CONRAD BERGENDOFF
Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois

Managing Editor
THEODORE S. LIEFELD
Capital University Seminary, Columbus, Ohio

Book Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Road, Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Circulation Manager
ANDREW S. BURGESS
Luther Seminary, Como Ave. and Luther Place, St. Paul, Minnesota

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.
Harvey D. Hoover
Abdel Ross Wentz

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.
Paul J. Hoh
T. G. Tappert

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.
C. G. Carfelt
Eric Wahlstrom

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO
E. C. Fendt

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.
Andrew S. Burgess

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA
Bernard Holm

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aims:* The aims of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

19355

Lutheran Service to Refugees

Stewart W. Herman

NOT since the fabled days of Alaric and Attila has Europe seen such a fantastic upheaval of peoples as the twentieth century has produced. Because the Roman Church rose phoenix-like out of the ashes of the old Roman Empire it is often lightly assumed that the same phenomenon will recur wherever the Christian Church is attacked, even in Eastern Europe. Is this true?

It must not be forgotten that the roles have been reversed. It was a pagan world which met defeat 1,500 years ago and a Christian world which emerged with power! One of the main factors in the astounding preservation of the young papal church was the timely conversion of many Teuton tribes who spared the only thing they respected. Fortunately, the barbarians who sacked Rome were, in great part, Christians!

Today it is very difficult to foresee that the destruction of old state-forms, especially in Eastern Europe, will automatically encourage a rebirth of the Christian religion. Whole churches—at least in the traditional aspect familiar to western Christians—have been smashed within their political and economic framework. One of the prime sufferers has been the Lutheran Church. Only Communism seems ready to inherit the past, and Communism does not appear to be ready to spare the church.

The first losses of the Russian Orthodox Church followed upon the Red Revolution after World War I, and it was in this period that the Lutheran Church of Russia disappeared. Important fragments of it were salvaged in the Baltic States, but never again could it be said that there were five million Lutherans in the great Russian Empire. The only Protestant church which retained a semblance of its former size in the USSR was the Baptist, which even yet is said to count about five million members.

Without dwelling on the past, I shall try to summarize in three sections the prodigious situation which developed at the end of World War II. The first section will deal with the Displaced Persons, the second section with the refugees of Germanic antecedents as well as German citizens, and the final section with the significance of these upheavals for the Lutheran Church.

I

THE LUTHERAN DPs

As a result of World War II the two or three millions of Lutherans remaining in the Baltic States, the Ukraine, and elsewhere were remorselessly scattered. Today the Archbishop of Estonia—almost totally a Lutheran land—is living in Lutheran Sweden. Half of the pastors fled with him to Sweden or Germany and of the other half only 50 per cent are reported to be carrying on their broken ministry in the homeland. The Archbishop of Latvia—a saintly octogenarian—occupies a third-floor, walk-up apartment in a DP camp in Germany. His people are no doubt the most publicized refugees in the world today as they move overseas into Canada, the U. S., and Australia. Together these two groups of Displaced Persons form the largest bloc of Lutherans who benefit by the provisions of the International Refugee Organization (IRO), but there are also many Lutherans among the Poles, Lithuanians, Hungarians, Czechoslovaks, and Yugoslavs. Most of them were uprooted during the war, but a large number have fled since the war as political refugees.

IRO assumed responsibility for the repatriation or resettlement of these DPs, of whom nearly one million were to be found in Germany and Austria at the end of the war and after UNRA had repatriated several million others. Gradually the rehabilitation of the remainder has been going forward, and it is fairly safe to say that, except for some tens of thousands—less than 100,000—belonging to the "hard core" of unresettlables, the problem will have been solved by the end of 1950. It was among the last million that the Lutheran World Federation first undertook its Service to

Refugees by inaugurating a "spiritual ministry" to a couple hundred thousand scattered brethren and slowly built up the churches-in-exile. Later this Christian service was extended to include resettlement counselling, including the provision of job- and housing-assurances for thousands who began moving to the United States.

WHAT IS "SPIRITUAL MINISTRY"?

Today the refugees are again grouped by vocations and professions, but for the first couple years they were simply "refugees." Pastors, too, were as penniless as their people and bishops were fortunate if they had saved as much as a black suit. Yet even before outside help arrived, little congregations began to take shape in certain camps and in some cases primitive chapels were set up in barracks unsuitable for other purposes. The first faint pulse in these shattered members of the Body of Christ became perceptible again.

The Lutheran World Federation arrived on the scene in the form of Dr. S. C. Michelfelder and Rev. Clifford A. Nelson, who made the first tentative surveys, as a result of which Dr. Howard Hong was commissioned to set up a "Service to Refugees" in Germany. His job was called primarily "spiritual ministry" because it was designed to help provide a solid support for the new churches-in-exile. It is worth emphasizing the fact that LWF never attempted to set up a chaplaincy service of its own for refugees; the object has always been to enable the refugee pastors to minister to their own people.

The funds allocated for Service to Refugees have been used largely for material supplies. Pastors immobilized in a single camp were given bicycles or even motorcycles. The Sunday Schools which were set up required a regular supply of carefully planned lessons in several languages. Congregations needed paper for small hymnals, Bibles, periodicals, etc. Deacons and deaconesses were provided with extra supplies of clothing or medicine to meet emergency calls. Above all else, there was a crying demand for supplementary food as the life of the DPs became less favored and crisis

followed crisis in the international chess game in which refugees rapidly became minor pawns. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been invested in food, in addition to contributions from Lutheran World Relief.

One of the boldest and best projects for DPs in Germany has been the LWF Study Center. Two of them—at Imbshausen in the British zone and at Berchtesgaden in the U. S. zone—have been operating for two years. Each of these centers is designed to revive the Christian hope of the broken churches by giving them an out-of-camp "retreat" to which all Christian men and women may be withdrawn for inspiration and instruction. Regular courses are offered and the attendance—usually 70 to 120 persons at a time—has been excellent. Our principal contributions to these valuable year-round Lutheran schools have been the general sponsorship, food, and special equipment. The basic expense has been borne by IRO and the teaching staff is recruited from among the refugees themselves.

The result of this intensive work among Lutheran DPs has been that the scattered and leaderless people of those first postwar months have been transformed by a new spirit of fellowship into vigorous Christian communities. Thousands of Baltic children are going regularly to Sunday School; Christian youth conferences draw thousands of Lutheran boys and girls; thousands of men and women have been prepared for emigration overseas with a far greater degree of calm confidence that their church stands beside them as God beckons them to walk further into a hazardous future.

For many DPs the terrible strain upon their faith in a loving Father is by no means past. For one thing, there may be heartaches ahead in the new land where no beneficent IRO exists to provide food and shelter. Here the receiving church can, of course, become a tremendous blessing to the tremulous immigrant. The presence of a friendly pastor on a pier or a railroad platform in a land full of strange sights and sounds is like the shade of a mighty rock in a dismaying desert. More than once this simple service has turned an indifferent DP church-member into a thankful, regular, ardent church-goer in his new hometown.

But, as this is being written, I am thinking primarily of thousands who will be left behind—not unlike the unattached old people of a primitive tribe who were left to die when the seasonal migration began. So far, the aged and infirm have been lodged in IRO-supported institutions where they have been visited by their pastors, but when IRO goes out of existence in June 1950, these twice-helpless people will be left precariously to the social agencies of the bankrupt states upon whose shores the tide of war has cast them. As far as it is financially possible, LWF will undertake to provide for all the Lutherans among them. One home for the aged is now being set up in collaboration with IRO and the Bavarian Church, and others will follow. However, most of the elderly and handicapped should be assisted to emigrate—especially from overloaded Austria.

Regardless of the diminution of IRO activity in 1950, LWF foresees no slackening of its Service to Refugees. The departure of Lutheran DPs in very large numbers to the U. S. and Australia does not really lead to a decrease of work. For one thing, we have never served even our own people adequately; for another thing, a vastly larger problem looms up as the DP problem approaches solution.

II

THE VOLKGERMANS AND EXPELLEES

As the ranks of the DPs grew thinner, a vast inchoate mass of other refugees became more easily perceptible. These were the *"Volkgermans"* and the *"expellees."* Both groups were the victims of the Potsdam Agreement signed at the end of the war by the victorious allies. By the provisions of this agreement the nations of Eastern Europe were permitted to cast out—"in an orderly and humane manner!"—the people of Germanic origin living among them. The theory was that these minorities constituted a permanent "fifth column" in the countries where they lived and that by this Draconian measure many minority problems could be forever solved.

The Volkgermans come from Rumania (the Transylvanians),

Poland (the Galicians), Czechoslovakia (the Sudetens), Yugoslavia (the Banat and Batschka Germans), etc. But the "expellees" are German citizens deprived of their homeland in East Prussia, Pomerania, and Silesia when these German provinces were annexed—*without* the blessing of Potsdam—by Russia and Poland. These latter regions were intended to be "occupied" like the rest of Germany, but, short of another war, they will probably never be disgorged.

The number of refugees of German origin is appallingly large. Between twelve and fifteen million people were sent into a truncated and bomb-blasted Germany where they found whatever shelter they could. I have seen them being moved out of Silesia, Danzig, Hungary, and the Sudetenland. It was truly a *Völkerwanderung,* not unlike the convulsive dislocations of the period between the fall of Rome and the Middle Ages. By far the largest percentage of these wanderers came from the lost provinces of Germany and, as German citizens, may be expected to make themselves more or less at home in Germany, even though they feel homesick and their local hosts are often hostile. But about two millions of them are "German" only by courtesy of racial descent—like the Pennsylvania Dutch—and successful assimilation for them under today's abnormal circumstances in Germany or Austria is highly unlikely.

There is no organization like IRO to care for this vast horde of Dispossessed Persons. The "racial policy" of the United Nations bars them from any form of IRO assistance. Thus they are thrown upon the war-wrecked economy of two defeated nations. For a long time it was the allied military policy to consider these people as an "internal" German problem, the main reason being that large numbers of them had always possessed German citizenship, and—secondly—that a sizable percentage of the rest had in one way or another found their way onto the Nazi *Volksliste,* or national register. This was the case with most of the Sudetens who of course were brought "Heim ins Reich" even before the outbreak of the war. The fact that most of these *Volksdeutsche* have always been regarded as "stateless" by the postwar German government authorities seems to carry little weight.

In one respect it is good that these unfortunate people are not encouraged by international sentiment to develop an even stronger feeling of separation. Short of another war most of them will never see their old homes again, and it is equally certain that most of them will never be able to emigrate. This applies particularly to the "expellees," who possess German nationality. From a church viewpoint it seems imperative to introduce them as rapidly as possible into the existing parishes in order to forestall the rise of German-speaking "churches-in-exile" within Germany. Therefore, there is no good reason for an international agency like the Lutheran World Federation, for instance, to provide a "spiritual ministry" to these refugees at the present time, except insofar as the Lutheran churches of Germany require help to master the huge job they face. That is not to say that the Lutheran World Federation has no legitimate interest in the refugees, however.

THE THREAT TO PEACE

For one thing, the whole Christian Church is interested in peace, and the presence of undigested—and indigestible—refugees in such quantities is a real threat to the hope of peace. In the 1949 elections in Germany, the refugees became a prime political issue and an abortive attempt was made by politicians—who like to cater to grievance-groups—to weld the forlorn mass into an effective weapon. One of the chief reasons why this sort of demagogic effort has so far failed is that many of the *Volksdeutsche* groups believed that their interests have been adequately represented by their "church welfare committees," of which seventeen were closely attached to the powerful nation-wide *Evangelisches Hilfswerk* whose far-sighted leader, Eugen Gerstenmaier, had done all he could to turn the face of the discontented toward the church rather than toward political parties. But, with the beginning of this year (1950) Hilfswerk becomes financially unable to continue its financial support to these auxiliary agencies.

Whether or not the Lutherans of the world will provide the funds to cope with this enormous problem fully is doubtful. Or—to be frank—it is not really doubtful; it is clearly impossible. Only

the Jews of the world seem to be able to raise their hundreds of millions of dollars while we Christians huff and puff to gather a few millions at a time. Nevertheless, something must be done in at least two directions for the "Germanic" refugees: every effort must be bent toward providing housing for them inside Germany. The Protestant church—through Hilfswerk—has already pioneered in this field by setting up the first colonies of homes, some of which in the early days had to be built of mud-bricks. This whole work makes evident the desirability of using a part of the American Lutheran gifts henceforth as a revolving building fund.

The second line of action is to mobilize the churches of the world to share the responsibility for absorbing a portion of the *Volksdeutsche* outside the country and thus relieve the pressure upon German and Austrian economy and Central European politics. There is a certain percentage of the refugees which is temperamentally incapable of settling down peaceably in Germany and Austria. In overcrowded countries they will spread the seed of discontent wherever they go and no matter how long they stay. Thus the emigration of even a few will serve as a "safety valve." At present there is a sense of suffocation within the so-called "prison-walls" of Germany which has frequently been likened to a huge concentration camp. Here again the church can take the lead by sponsoring a carefully selective Emigration Aid Service, and it is this which the Lutheran World Federation is already doing on a worldwide scale.

DIFFICULTIES OF EMIGRATION

Indeed in many countries there is a definite preference for German immigrants. This is especially true in South America, Australia, and elsewhere, where local experience with German immigration has been favorable but where nations such as Latvia and Estonia are virtually unknown. Southern Europeans, also Poles, Hungarians, and others are not always held in high esteem. The Lutheran World Federation has coordinated the work of committees in all parts of South America (which I visited in the spring of 1949), Australia, Canada, etc. Over 200 *Volksdeutsche* farm

families were sent to Canada in the summer of 1949 and many more will go to Australia and Canada in 1950. A steady trickle of Lutherans is beginning to flow into South America, largely under the direct sponsorship of officially appointed church committees.

All of this involves great expense because—in contrast to the arrangements for DPs whose passage is paid by IRO—the *Volksdeutsche* must turn to LWF or other agencies for help. Even if passages average only $220 each, it can easily be seen how few persons can be helped with, let us say, one million dollars. Yet at least one million people ought to be moved out of Western Germany, where—in the U. S., British, and French zones alone—there are about eight million newcomers. Hundreds are coming in from the Russian zone every day, thus increasing the burden. Every little village is stuffed to the bursting point, and it is not uncommon to find the least lucky eking out a shelterless existence in the open fields or dark forests.

III

THE SAVING OF SOULS

It is worth repeating that the Lutheran Church has suffered huge losses in the course of these national upheavals. Reference has already been made to the once-flourishing communities in Russia and the Baltic states. To these must be added not only a heavy percentage of Lutherans from the Balkans but also the almost solidly Evangelical constituencies of East Prussia, Pomerania, and Silesia in northeastern Germany. To be sure, they were part of the Prussian Union and had lost much of their Lutheran flavor, but it can safely be stated that they were more than 90 per cent Lutheran in origin and retained both the Lutheran catechism and a strong sense of loyalty to the Augsburg Confession. It was these churches —with their wealth of hospitals, deaconess institutions, schools, and historic shrines—which were totally smashed and their people scattered penniless over the whole of Western Europe. It can be wondered that faith was not shattered too.

The Lutherans represented in these areas alone may be estimated at five millions, at the very least. This is roughly equivalent

to the total Lutheran population of the United States! Needless to say, the absolute loss of so many members would spell serious injury to our church, but in this day of omnicompetent international organizations which seem to be designed to relieve us of being our brother's keeper, we are more apt to think of the refugees as an immense "problem" than as an important fragment of world Lutheranism. Christian sentiment has become almost exclusively humanitarian rather than religious. In applauding the actions of governments in contributing billions to refugee relief, we think happily of bodies saved from starvation but only belatedly of the soul's salvation.

The saving of souls is intimately involved in the process of resettling "bodies," which in certain circles became a popular way of referring to human beings. What man when lifted out of the postwar misery of Europe and thrown penniless into the highly competitive and crassly materialistic business life of South America, for example, can resist the temptation to adjourn his Protestant convictions in a nominally Roman Catholic environment? In fact, how many Lutherans among the tens of thousands who went to Great Britain would actually—as was quite sincerely hoped—find their way into the Anglican or other Protestant communions? Few people who have any knowledge of comparative religious traditions doubt that the losses not merely to certain denominations but to the whole Christian Church would have been enormous, if the churches had not set out to follow their own people in their broken wanderings. The Lutheran World Federation has tried to mobilize all the resources of its member-churches to meet the threatened loss and, if possible, to transform it into a gain.

SALVAGING THE SHIPWRECKED CHURCHES

An outstanding example is Venezuela. When Lutheran DPs began to arrive in that oil-rich country with its incredible contrast between "boom" and "bust," there was no Lutheran Church on hand. The main Protestant communities—aside from the English-language American Church in the swank section of Caracas—were very humble Spanish-language missions based entirely on a most

elementary type of service aimed at the uneducated or illiterate. But among the first DPs there was a Latvian pastor who had contracted to drive a tractor in the interior. He did his stint and then turned back to the ministry. It was then that LWF came to his support and enabled him to begin services not only for his own countrymen but also to other immigrants. In less than a year he has found a potential parish of 2,000 people—including 1,000 Latvians—in various centers in Venezuela and, thanks to a special gift from the U. S., has a jeep for more efficient traveling back and forth. The next project is to establish a day-school and nursery in Caracas.

A vastly different picture is presented by Australia, where two well-organized Lutheran churches exist, one belonging to the Lutheran World Federation and the other associated with the Missouri Synod. Both have been very active and also cooperative in the tasks of helping their government to receive and absorb the generous quantities of DPs to whom new homes have been offered. But both churches are relatively small—about 25,000 members each —and their resources are naturally limited. By the end of 1949 about 20,000 Lutheran refugees had arrived in the country and were scattered far and wide over the continent.

The problem of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Australia, which especially desired to serve its fellow-members of the Lutheran World Federation, was to provide salaries and expenses for several supplementary DP pastors. It could not be expected that the immigrants themselves in so short a time would be in a position to support their own churches. Yet, if action were not taken at once, a golden opportunity might be lost. Thus, the central funds of "Service to Refugees" were used to subsidize a spiritual ministry program thousands of miles away from Europe in a new homeland.

Reference has already been made to Great Britain where a startling development has occurred. England had offered asylum to many refugees both during and after the war and the resultant mixture was as varied and as colorful as the imagination can conceive. Except for certain "embassy churches," Lutheranism was

virtually unknown. But now there were approximately 40,000 of this faith who presumably would settle down for the rest of their lives. The British churches set to work to help them, especially by sponsoring the pastors. Under this kindly tolerance the work flourished.

Here a different kind of cooperation with the Missouri Synod, which was nourishing two small congregations in England, became possible. An agreement was reached whereby the expenses of adequate aid to our Lutheran brethren in England would be shared equally by the Missouri Synod and the National Lutheran Council. This financial aid and cooperation finally served to draw all the different Lutheran refugee groups—including Germans and Poles! —into a Lutheran Council of Great Britain which is growing into a vigorous body with a sense of self-confidence and authority. Some day—God willing!—its half-dozen languages and traditions may be melted into a fine, strong Lutheran Church in England, but that is not the first end toward which we are striving, namely, serving our refugees.

LEFT-OVER PASTORS

The problem of pastors is difficult. It is not an easy matter for the Lutheran "churches in exile" to condemn themselves to extinction, yet this is what must happen. As the DP pastors move out into new relationships with other Lutheran groups, their previous identification with a national ecclesiastical body is lost and the old loyalty must be transmuted into a wider ecumenical appreciation of their own denomination and of the whole Christian Church. It seems inevitable that some of these pastors will even be required to abandon hope of reentering the active ministry, not because of lack of consecration, but simply because of language handicaps. Every receiving nation demands that its new immigrants must become assimilated as rapidly as possible and there is no church that can afford to maintain a large staff of foreign-language ministers. In Sweden, Australia, England, and the U. S., Lutheran pastors are already working at non-church jobs, even though LWF has been paying special attention to every war-struck pastor.

VOLKSDEUTSCHE RESETTLEMENT

In one respect the problem of resettling the Volkgerman refugees may be easier. As yet there is no such organization as IRO working frantically against a deadline to emigrate as many people as possible. Any resettlement of Germanic refugees will probably be a less artificial movement insofar as it will develop gradually and find a more natural outlet in regular immigration channels—not special "D. P. Acts." Moreover, the way will be made easier by the existence of German settlements in many parts of the world where further German colonization, under certain conditions, would be welcomed.

On the other hand, no provision has yet been made to finance a *Volksdeutsche* emigration program and our church is burdened with a sensation of helplessness in the face of such great need. Without adequate international assistance—for example, from ECA funds—there is little hope of relieving the terrible pressure of refugees upon German and Austrian economy. Meanwhile, LWF has set up a revolving fund to begin the resettlement of small numbers of these victims of peace, with or without pastors. More than 200 families, as we have seen, went to Canada in the summer of 1949 and soon other pioneer groups will start for Chile and Australia, even Brazil.

The best that LWF can do under the present circumstances is to set up "pilot projects" which may serve to show the nations how this enormous problem can be solved. One of the greatest drawbacks to a swift movement of such emigrants is that many national groups—such as the Transylvanians or Bessarabians—insist upon trying to settle *en bloc*. No nation today wants to have indigestible, closed colonies of foreigners. The pastors themselves have frequently been guilty of fostering a sterile nationalism among their people who now must resolutely choose between waiting as best they can for the old homeland or striking out boldly across the seas.

NATIONALISM AND LUTHERANISM

One of the greatest impediments to united Christian action in tackling the refugee question is not so much the divisive denomi-

nationalism of our churches, but the fact that the churches themselves seem to be almost incurably nationalistic. This applies not only to the Lutherans in exile who understandably feel reluctant to abandon their last hold upon a common past which was precious and sacred to them. (I am not now speaking of superficial politicians who have frequently tried to retain a church office largely as a spiritual center for a "government in exile.") It applies also to the deep-seated nationalism of the church people in countries which ought to hold their doors wide open instead of letting a trickle of refugees slip through a few tiny slits in the formidable immigration barriers.

It is especially true of Lutherans that there is little or no sense of world solidarity, despite the fact that we constitute one of the few churches which can point from all quarters of the earth's compass to a single accepted statement of common faith, to wit, the Augsburg Confession. Although the cooperation which has marked our present Service to Refugees in many quarters has been exceedingly gratifying, it is devoutly to be desired that the sufferings of the Lutheran Church in this vast *Völkerwanderung* may lead to a broader ecumenical perception of the things we hold in common. This could constitute an important contribution both to world peace and to the harmony of Christendom.

Nihilism—In West and East*

Ernest Benz

A HISTORY of nihilism has not yet been written. Indeed it is still an unanswered question when the word itself originated, by whom it was first used, and with what meaning. In German philosophical and religious history the word "nihilism" first appears with a precise significance in a nineteenth century philosopher of religion, Franz von Baader, who ever more clearly establishes himself as the most influential personage in the spiritual history of this enigmatic century. He uses this idea of nihilism in a manner that brings us directly to his main philosophical and theological interest, namely the reuniting of science and religion. We find these repeated utterances about nihilism in his addresses and letters after his return from an unsuccessful visit to Russia, a visit which itself had to do with the realization of this objective of a reconciliation of science and religion. Franz von Baader traced the spiritual source of the European catastrophe, which politically manifested itself in the French revolution and the imperialism of Napoleon, to the break-up of the unity of faith and knowledge. This had gradually developed since the days of the Renaissance and Reformation and on the one hand had led to the atheistic turn of the natural sciences and on the other to an anti-rational turn of a theology based on its own historical confessions and dogmas.

This conflict in the areas of science and theology has, in the opinion of Baader, led to their widest separation in his own time, because science has rejected all normative standards and so abused its autonomous reason as to bring into question and to overthrow

*The Editor secured the permission of the author, Ernest Benz, professor of Church History at Marburg, Germany, to translate (with some abbreviation) his treatise on *Westlicher Und Ostlicher Nihilismus in Christlicher Sicht* 1948 for the Quarterly. Prof. Benz is an authority on the relations of the Eastern and Western Church, and has presented in this work a startling analysis of the origin of modern nihilism which is recognized today as the most insidious foe of Christianity and Christian culture. The German work is published by Evangelisches Verlagswerk, Stuttgart.

all divine ordinances. This destructive abuse of reason in the scientific sphere is matched in the political by the Revolution. Just this final stage of a development whereby reason cuts loose from revelation is termed nihilism by Baader, and to him the main peril of his century is this kind of nihilism which reveals the destructive consequences of a reason which casts off altogether the yoke of revelation. From Berlin he wrote on April 6, 1824 to Windischmann:

> The Catholic Church needs not now be concerned about the earlier attempted Reformation (which arose out of a need to conserve the inner religious life), nor with early Protestantism, but with a revolutionary and Christ-hating fire which has broken out also in Catholic parishes, with this *nihilism* of our time. It protests in principle against every ecclesiastical doctrine, and declares church as well as state to be not something that we naively have considered too certain and positive nor something less than this, but primarily to be only *nothing,* that is, problematic, unfinished and still in the making. It is this common revolutionary and anti-Christian spirit which *all Christian confessions* now together need to oppose.

Here nihilism appears as a counter-movement, directed against the Christian Church, the Christian faith, the Christian community, the Christian state, and maintaining that the present order which was based on Christian doctrines was not a given truth but *nothing.* It purposed to create by revolution its own new order dependent only on itself. Characteristically Franz von Baader described this nihilism as the common foe of all present forms of the Christian church and considered Protestantism as well as Catholicism threatened by this opponent. It is clear from several expressions that he thought the Protestants more open to the attack of nihilism. Nevertheless, though a Catholic, he looked upon them as allies in the conflict with this destructive power, and therefore in the letter to Windischmann he held it was necessary to urge the Roman Catholic church to offer help to that part of the Protestant church which was most strongly setting itself against the inroads of nihilism into its camp. "Ought not the Roman Catholics give assistance to the favored party in the civil war which has now broken out among the Protestants? Or will they aid the wrong side by having nothing to do with either?"

Again in 1824 Baader expressed himself on the problem of nihilism, this time more fully, in his treatise *On Catholicism and Protestantism*. His treatment here is especially noteworthy inasmuch as he presents nihilism in the sense already mentioned as the consequence of the separation of the original unity between knowledge and faith. Nihilism is only one result of this divorce—along with it as its antithesis is an obscurant Pietism which is hostile to science and because of its narrow concept of faith denies the possibility of a scientific presentation of the truth of revelation just as much as nihilism from its critical and faith-inimical premises denies the possibility of union between religion and science. Nihilism and Pietism (Obscurantism) are thus the historical antitheses that necessarily go together, condition each other, and reveal the end result of a separation in which the Christian West fulfills its peculiar fall into sin, the destruction of the unity of faith and knowledge, of science and religion.

Also Baader emphasizes that both Confessions have been caught in this development, but especially Protestantism because more than in the case of Roman Catholicism its own religious principles have assisted this dissolution of a unity of faith and reason. He writes thus:

> Since therefore the older, original Protestantism is no more, but has fallen prey partly to this destructive, scientific nihilism and partly to a non-scientific separatistic Pietism (mysticism), so the Catholic defense (as well as the Protestant) must be directed against each of these two forms in which Protestantism has lost itself. It cannot be denied that also the Catholic clergy have at the same time been infected by both, and that one part of them have tended towards the *Aufklärung* in its bad sense (Illuminism), and another towards pietistic separatism, while only a third part remained true to that church in which formerly science and mysticism throve in a living relationship. Through the Reformation, however, a part was torn away, and this tearing away from a living relationship could only have finally as its consequence this observed degeneration (in nihilism and Pietism).

Further, this leads to the urging of support for that branch of Protestantism which is able to oppose the nihilism which has invaded it. The strategy of the church requires not only resistance

to the invasion in its own ranks, but also assistance to the anti-nihilistic forces in Protestantism. Therefore, Baader continues in this letter: "The nihilistic, scientific force or deformity of the new Protestantism deserves no rescue, but Pietism on the other hand does deserve help if only because all religious life must necessarily save itself here from the nothingness of that which has ceased to be a church, but also because this Pietism, without knowing or willing it, works a mighty solvent of all confessions which have separated themselves from the church and really are Protestant."

In his address *Concerning the Freedom of the Intelligence* on the occasion of the opening of the Ludwig-Maximilian University in Munich (1826), Baader summarizes his thought in a manner most influential on his contemporaries and marking essentially the introduction of the philosophical concept of nihilism into the scientific language of the century. He took advantage of this festive opening of the University of Munich to present the fundamentals of his own thinking—the reunion of learning and religion—as the fundamental concern of his century which alone could overcome the difficult spiritual and political crises of the day. In his address he described the schism between learning and religion as going back to the Reformation and as the root of all European evils. He pictured the existing condition of spiritual and religious life in which science, hostile to faith and atheistic, confronted a faith, unscientific and obscurantist, as the result of this schism, which could be healed only by a reunion of learning and religion. The gist of this address is as follows:

> We as laymen ought to be reminded that only through united effort of the secular learned and the clergy can we solve the greatest problem of our time—the problem of the reunion, the restoration, and the consecration of learning by religion as well as the confirmation of the doctrines of religion by learning. So I rejoice in calling the attention of both our own country and foreign lands to the historically important establishment here of the Ludwig-Maximilian University, for under these very auspices we shall not fail in giving effective opposition both to the *Nihilism* and the *Obscurantism* of our time, that is both against the abuse of intelligence tending toward the destruction of religion, as also against the equally evil *inhibition of the use of intelligence* arising partly out of fear, partly out of despising of learning.

It should be noted also that von Baader privately, in his letters, gave a political interpretation to this line of thought, in that he saw the spiritual antithesis of nihilism and obscurantism paralleled by a political antithesis between Prussia and Austria. We find this second example employing the concept of nihilism, in a letter of November 28, 1826 to the Graf Armansperg. Here he tells of his address at the University of Munich and writes thus, "While the undersigned respectfully takes the liberty of sending Your Excellency a copy of a recent address, he flatters himself in hoping that Your Excellence will not disapprove of the way and manner in which I then disappointed the expectations both of the pious sheep and of the impious goats, and counselled the university to keep itself just as free from (Prussian) nihilism as from (Austrian) obscurantism."

However we may feel about Baader's judgment concerning the historical roots of the phenomenon which he was the first to designate as *nihilism,* he has doubtlessly discerned two things accurately:

1. Franz von Baader probably alone in his day recognized the revolutionary forces which lay dormant in this which he called "nihilism." He saw that the essence of this nihilism consisted in man's denial of God, in the ignoring of the existence of God and of a divine order in the world, and in man's setting of himself and his insatiable striving for power and knowledge in the place of God. He saw, further, that this unleashed striving for power and knowledge concealed an impulse towards an unbounded and continuous overturning of all existing order. He expressly referred to this in a work also dating from the year 1824, *Concerning the need of our time for an inner unity between learning and religion.* There he emphasized that the nihilistic tendency of modern thought necessarily leads to the declaration of "the absolute sovereignty of man."

Such doctrines will surely enkindle in young minds the rebellious spirit of pride, self-exaltation and egoism, and the fruits which they bring from the academies and universities into public life can be no other than a deep-grounded hatred and contempt for all (civil and religious) institutions of

society which are not characterized by this arbitrary self-determination of the individual but presuppose a determination by law and a subordination of the self, and are founded on the conviction that only that can have authority over man which he himself has not constituted. And since there slumbers in every human heart a seed of the lust to destroy, it will not be possible, once such doctrines of the absolute sovereignty or autonomy of man awaken this seed in the minds of at least individual youths, to prevent it from growing into the fury of destructiveness, and from identifying finally this urge to destroy with the very instinct of existence, inasmuch as such a person must destroy (hate and annihilate what exists) if only to keep alive the continuity of the feeling to exist.

Franz von Baader here declares in ominous words that this nihilism must end in a double proclamation: first the proclamation that God is dead, that God and the transcendental world simply no longer exist; second, the corresponding proclamation of the superman, who by virtue of his "absolute sovereignty" takes the place of the dethroned God.

2. Baader recognized the antithesis between modern nihilism and the modern attempt of pietism to restore Christianity. Each presupposed the other. A Christianity which retreats into a narrow attitude of faith opposed to learning and which hopes to avoid scientific knowledge by a flight into obscurantism only strengthens the spokesmen of atheistic science in their denial of the Christian revelation. These on the other hand only strengthen the spokesmen of Pietism in their hostility and contempt of science.

The development of Western nihilism in the course of the nineteenth century fully confirmed the forebodings and insights of Franz von Baader. Ludwig Feuerbach's philosophy of religion finally developed into a denial of the reality of a transcendental world. God and the Beyond are revealed as reflections of human consciousness, as a mythological exposition of man—the only reality is man himself, who is sole creator of his gods. But though Feuerbach still sought to rescue religion for its anthropological kernel, his more consistent contemporaries promptly threw religion wholly overboard, even claiming that its elimination was an urgent need. Karl Marx's formula, "Religion is the opiate of a people" derives altogether from Feuerbach's philosophy of religion, as far

as its philosophical source is concerned—Feuerbach as well as Marx considered religion a mythological mist produced by man to explain his existence—but Marx draws the revolutionary consequences of this philosophy of religion: religion is the opiate of a people, that is, a mythological self-doping by which men delude themselves about the social misery of their existence, and thus prevent an attack on and removal of their misery. Instead of the Christian hope of the Beyond he substitutes an earthly eschatology, with its goal of the creation of a perfect society, whose social structure no more would force men into the condition where they need to deaden themselves with the opium of religion, because there would no longer be any "sufferings of this life" which perplex men so that they seek to forget the misery of this vale of sorrow and to excuse themselves from efforts to remove these ills. The aim of social progress is to bring about the social conditions which will make religion unnecessary and superfluous. Karl Marx is consistent in relating his teachings to the materialistic natural sciences and basing his controversy with the church and the Christian faith on the argument that faith and science exclude each other, that the church is the foe of all learning, and he never ceased to accuse the church in ever new forms of polemics of being guilty of scientific and intellectual obscurantism.

The disintegration of faith in the reality of a transcendent world was an event of apocalyptical proportions and the first one to recognize its significance in his century was the same man who brought western nihilism to its culmination, namely, Friedrich Nietzsche. In him we find all the elements which Franz von Baader had intimated would come with nihilism. In the first place the antithesis to Pietism, which was so important for the development of Nietzsche in his youth: the inner opposition to the narrow Pietism of the parental home, the discovery of the critical liberal theology of his day, which opened his eyes to the abyss of the "holy lie," the casting off of the Christian heritage and his turning to philology. Further, in his later philosophical teaching exactly the two themes emerge which Baader already had foreseen as inevitable results of the development of nihilism: the proclamation

of the death of God and the proclamation of the superman. Both are intimately connected with each other, and Nietzsche has placed them in immediate relationship, most impressively in the *Frölichen Wissenschaft.*[1] There we read:

> The most important of more recent events that "God is dead," that the belief in the Christian God has become unworthy of belief already begins to cast its first shadows over Europe. To the few at least whose eye, whose suspecting glance, is strong enough and subtle enough for this drama, some sun seems to have set, some old, profound confidence seems to have changed into doubt: our old world must seem to them daily more darksome, distrustful, strange and "old." In the main, however, one may say that the event itself is far too great, too remote, too much beyond most people's power of apprehension, for one to suppose that so much as the report of it could have *reached* them; not to speak of many who already know *what* had taken place, and what must all collapse now that this belief has been undermined—for example our entire European morality. This lengthy, vast and uninterrupted process of crumbling destruction, ruin and overthrow which is now imminent: who has realized it sufficiently today to have to stand up as the teacher and herald of such a tremendous logic of error, as the prophet of a period of gloom and eclipse, the like of which has probably never taken place on earth before.

The news, "God is dead," is here wholly conceived in the sense of Feuerbach: the faith in the Christian God has become unworthy of belief, that is, God has never existed as a belief, as a myth, which believing Christians created as an expression of their experience of life, of their spiritual condition, of their understanding of man. This God, that is, this faith has now become unworthy of belief, and therefore the whole ordering of life and of society collapses because these rested on this faith. Nietzsche herewith makes known that the de-christianizing of the concept of man which has gone on for centuries now had reached its culmination. An anti-Christian, atheistic, materialistic natural science had made man to be one among other earthly forms of life, the relations between man and God had been systematically taken to pieces, man is comprehended in a purely immanent world view, the transcendental

1 1882. The following quotation is from the English translation of *The Joyful Wisdom,* p. 275, Vol. 10 (2 ed. 1886) in *Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche,* ed. by Oscar Levy (London: 1910).—Editor.

One forgotten, even more, denied existence and revealed as a fiction and mythological product of human consciousness itself. What many in the course of the century, without knowing it, had gradually destroyed, Nietzsche proclaimed in the gleeful and demoniacal consciousness of this destruction. Along with the image of God, God himself is put to death, for without man he "cannot for a moment exist." Man makes ready to ascend the throne of God, and this murder, this assassination in the greatest of revolutions, fills him with the triumphal consciousness of super-humanity. No more will he be limited by a God and no longer need he measure himself by an image of any God. "Is not the immensity of this deed too great for us? Must we not ourselves become gods?"

This announcement, "God is dead," through its characteristic connection with the proclamation of the superman became the most epochal message of the nineteenth century, and the most expressive description of the nihilistic revolution which beginning in the realm of the spirit ever since in ever new impulses has drawn into whirling rapids the political and social organizations of Europe. This cry, celebrating the death of God as an "achievement" of man, inaugurates the epoch of truly deified man who established himself in the world, disdaining any metaphysical author, regarding every obligation to God as a violation of his own sovereignty, and hating no one more than those who blasphemously honor the shades of a god in the ancient grottoes where once he lived.

So, from the Christian point of view, it is only logical that he who proclaims the superman should praise the death of God as an achievement, and that the announcement of the superman should coincide with the news of the death of God. Also the point of time in which the death of God is proclaimed should readily be given eschatological significance and in a Christian sense be interpreted as "the most important of more recent events," for with it begins a final war to the death against the Christian view of man and the Christian teaching concerning the relationship between man and God and the consequent attitude of man towards God and his neighbor.

The prophecy of Nietzsche meanwhile has been fulfilled. If he

could say that the "event" was "far too remote," it has become all too clear what kind of an era has come and what it means to sever the bonds between God and man, by the events of the warfare against the Christian concepts of man and of God now spread over the world and with the collapse of National Socialism only seemingly arrested. What Nietzsche promised as a "lengthy, vast and uninterrupted process of crumbling destruction, ruin and overthrow" has for our generation become a daily experience.

The history of *Eastern* nihilism has so far received no more systematic presentation than the Western form. Two eminent scholars of Russian philosophy have treated individual phenomena and personalities of Russian nihilism, and their works give the best introduction to the problem. The one is Thomas G. Masaryk,[2] later president of Czechoslovakia, whose writings on Russian philosophy are characterized by unusual thoroughness in source studies, while his presentation of Russian nihilism belongs to that part of his work which shows very careful and profound reflection. The second authority on Russian nihilism is Nicolas Berdyaev whose *Meaning and Fate of Russian Communism* (German Ed. 1937) gives us an illuminating account of the spiritual development of the personalities of Russian nihilism, especially of Dobroljubov and Chernishevsky.

In comparing the development of Western and Russian nihilism probably the most striking resemblance is this that, like Nietzsche in Germany, it is the sons of priests and ecclesiastics and members of theological seminaries who furnish the leading representatives of nihilism. In both countries it is the experience of the untrustworthiness of the Christian church and its representatives, and the glimpse into the background and abyss of a corrupt, conventional Christianity, which led the thinkers who were exposed to these experiences to their nihilistic view of man and the world. Nicolas Berdyaev makes this fact the starting point of his treatment of Russian nihilism.

2 *Zur russischen Geschichts—und Religions Philosophie. Soziologische Skizzen,* 2 Bde. (Jena: 1913). Ed. Note—Trans. *The Spirit of Russia. Studies in History, Literature and Philosophy* by Eden and Cedar Paul, 2 vols. (London: 1919).

It is not by chance that the sons of the Russian priests who were trained in the seminaries played a decisive role in Russian nihilism, and that the leading journalists of the sixties, Dobroljubov and Chernishevsky, came out of just these groups. The importance of this phenomenon was twofold: these seminarians were influenced in a religious sense by the idea of ascetic world-denial, and at the same time had the opportunity to see deeply into the inner rottenness of a professed Christianity and to experience personally its sins. They became the initiators of opposition against the spiritual leaders, the oppressive atmosphere of the ecclesiastical schools, and against the whole world of this decayed Christianity. Already in the fifties there was fermentation in the circles of the seminaries, and in the sixties the spirit of revolt broke through. The seminarians were captivated by the ideas of freedom inherent in the Enlightenment and gave to them peculiarly Russian, extremist, form. At the same time there awakened in these youth a yearning for social justice which they transformed under the influence of their Christian education.[3]

The fact that the Russian church not only permitted the atrocious social and political sins of Russia but even sanctioned them made a deep impression on this generation, and it was equally affected by the dark character of the spiritual life of the Russian church, and especially of the faculties of the ecclesiastical academies and seminaries. This youth came to view the Russian church both from scientific and social standpoints as the outright enemy of a renovation of the social order, and gave themselves with fiery enthusiasm to the materialistic learning of the West. They considered as true science and they hailed with joy its fundamental hostility to Christianity. There can be no doubt that the ecclesiastical and religious development of Christianity in the eighteenth and the early nineteenth century in East and West has itself contributed and is party to the atheistic movement. Ricarda Huch in her work, *Michael Bakunin and Anarchy,* has described this development in a manner both radical and accurate when she writes:

The Almighty, placed on the throne by a victorious Church, altered his features fully, but so slowly and in accommodation to men that those for the most part never even noticed it. The great Jehovah, the All-Father, in whose hands lay blessing and curse, the eternal source of inexhaustible creativity

3 Berdyaev, Nicolas, *Sinn und Schicksal des russichen Kommunismus* (Lucerne: 1937), p. 54 (English trans. *The Meaning and Fate of Russian Communism*).

and doom, became a doorkeeper in Hotel Europa with the task of keeping order in a manner most comfortable for those guests best able to pay. He was a doorkeeper in rich livery, so majestic that one dared not even approach him without a good tip. His sensing of the social status of each one was infallible; before his forbidding glance even the boldest of the have-nots became conscious of his own poverty as he came in with his travelling-bag. Into such a porter God had gradually become transformed. He had been well cared for—therefore he was supposed to preserve the existing order. The status quo was illuminated by halos of holiness. The greatest sin, the greatest ignorance, the most obvious delusion, was to want to destroy what prevailed.

This transformation of the Lord of hosts into an ordinary porter explains many enigmas. It helps to explain why many persons otherwise ideally disposed would rather be called atheists than worshippers of such a god. These were persons who with childlike simplicity recognized that this was not the apparel of the emperor and that the sacrifice of the vassals took place in shirt-sleeves, that this ruler could impossibly be God who created light and separated earth from heaven. They rebelled against him and said to his face that they owed him no adoration and could get along without him. The more the adoration of the living God filled them, through whose kingdom the hotel dwellers passed without recognizing, greeting, or longing for Him, the more repulsive seemed the majesty at the hotel-door, and when finally it ceased to use the name of God the name itself became odious and they avoided using it, in fact they deliberately removed it in order to clear the road. Thus it happened that it could be said of the Russian nihilists that their logic was: man is descended from a monkey, consequently love thy neighbor as thyself. They found a defiant satisfaction in discovery of every statement which seemed to contradict the church, the Bible, the Catechism, and on their banner they inscribed atheism, though they really meant the absence of the porter.

Thus it happened that among the Russian nihilists there were just this kind of persons, who had been brought up in a strict Christian manner in the sense of the church of that period and when they discovered the contradiction between profession and reality they turned to atheism. For example Nicholas Dobroljubov (1836-1861) had gone through a regular orthodox training and in his youth was outspokenly religious, was inclined towards an ascetic life, was filled with a consciousness of the sinfulness of mankind, in every respect a pure and earnest personality. Experiences which painfully impressed upon him the falsehood and unrighteousness of a social order consecrated by the church led him to throw over-

board entirely the faith in God he had been taught. Berdyaev thus characterized his development:

> Neither the world of nature, which was darkened by the death of his mother, nor human society, in which he found no trace of a realization of the Christian commandments, gave him any contentment. He felt himself surrounded by a "kingdom of darkness," and thus came to the decision to take up the struggle for light dependent only on himself. God had left the world in darkness, therefore man must himself provide for its illumination. Enlightenment of the people and revolution became for Dobroljubov the only path to a reconstruction of life. After he had lost his faith he recognized no other goal than the earthly welfare of man and he sacrificed himself without pity in the struggle for the welfare of others. His own life was without happiness—he died early of tuberculosis.[4]

The "new man" dependent entirely on himself here takes the place of God, indeed achieves a place by driving God away, and his expulsion becomes the decisive point in the revolutionary program. This has been very characteristically formulated by Peter Kropotkin, the "anarchistic apostle of humanitarianism" in these words, "Gods pass, Kings pass. The prestige of authority passes. Who shall take the place of gods, kings, and priests, if not the free individual, confident in his own powers? Simple faith vanishes. Make way for science! Caprice and charity disappear. Make way for justice."[5] Back of this is the accusation against the prevailing system of authority, of the arbitrariness, the obscurantism, which the church in power endorses and sanctifies, and whose injustice the church vainly seeks to conceal by a program of charity ameliorating the worst sores.

Nicholas Gabrilovitsch Chernishevsky (1828-1889), "the real idol of the radical Russian Intelligentsia," the leading theorist of Russian nihilism and proponent of atheistic socialism, was also in his youth a believing Christian. By birth a son of a highly placed clergyman, he received a theological education and attended along with other sons of ministers an ecclesiastical school. He was a man of wide learning, at home in theology and philosophy, in history

4 *Ibid.*, p. 55.
5 Masaryk, T. G., *The Spirit of Russia*, pp. 112-113.

and natural science, above all in political science. He possessed all the qualifications for an academic career, but forsook everything else in order to give himself to the social struggle. Through a nineteen-year imprisonment and banishment to Siberia he became a martyr of the social revolution, especially since his sentence was the result of forged documents and false witnesses. His most famous work is the romantic and utopian "Was tun?" (What is to be done?), which became the catechism of Russian nihilism. Chernishevsky was a Christian believer even in his student days and during his working in Feuerbach, but through Feuerbach he finally threw his faith overboard, and after 1850 he took his stand logically as positivist and materialist.

He also puts in the place of the overthrown god the "new man," whose image he pictures in the hero of his novel, *Rachmetov*. In this work the function of this "new man" is thus described: "There are not many of you, but in you all life thrives, which otherwise would be stifled. You are few, but you enable mankind to breathe which would suffocate without you. Great is the multitude of honorable and good people, but there are few like yourselves. Yet you are in them—the tea leaves in the tea, the delicate odor of the wine. You are the strength and the aroma, the flower of the aristocracy, the impulse of movement, and the salt of the earth." In his aforementioned work Masaryk[6] has rightly observed that this proclamation of the superman appears strangely out of place within the ideology of revolutionary socialism, and points out the inner contradiction between socialism on the one hand and extreme individualism on the other. "In his essay on Thierry he writes in an almost elegiac strain when he represents the crowd as incompetent to understand and to esteem work done on its behalf. He consequently recommends the great men whom he admires to seek the justification for their activities in those activities themselves, untroubled by the question whether the crowd (he constantly employs the word *tolpa,* which contemptuously denotes the unintelligent mob) can follow them; and he writes, 'to close one's career in bitter solitude of the understanding and of the heart, this is worthy

6 *Op. cit.,* II:31.

of undying respect and admiration.' " Here, long before Nietzsche, the notes of the superman begin to be heard.

It is true that in the main Germany has not had access to the works of the Russian nihilists because either these works have not been translated into German or if they have, they have not reached a wider public. Yet this fact is outweighed by the other, that classical Russian literature has brought us in a truly shocking manner the inner picture of the Russian nihilism of the nineteenth century by its series of descriptions of types of humanity and personalities. Here it is above all Fyodor Dostoyevsky who more than any other has struggled with the spirit of nihilism and has embodied it in literary forms in a group of figures, above all in his novel, *The Brothers Karamazov.* The representative of modern nihilism is portrayed supremely in Ivan Karamazov, who "does not accept this world as God's," who is consumed in his devastating hatred of God and His world, and who sees in all the deficiencies, terrors, and unrighteousness of this world the obnoxious consequences of the illusion of "God." For him the solution is the getting rid of God, the annihilation of the Christian interpretation of God, from man and from the world. Historically he would evade the epoch of the Christian view of God and the Christian way of life, an evasion to be realized by the plan of beginning anew the feast of humanity and following the "new humanity" devoid of history and of God.

(There follows a lengthy section composed of quotations from *The Brothers Karamazov,* here omitted since this work is available in English.)

In ecclesiastical circles it is a favorite opinion that the rise of nihilism and its apocalyptical development since the beginning of the nineteenth century are to be considered as the "mystery of iniquity," against which the church finds itself in opposition without being able rationally to comprehend its nature and whose demonic attacks simply belong to the lot of the church. Undoubtedly this view can be justified and it can be claimed that the fate of Christ is also the fate of the church in this world. Nevertheless the church cannot today be satisfied with this answer. The "mystery of iniquity" has in the course of the history of the church always

appeared most menacingly where the purest charismatic powers of the church have developed—it has sometimes revealed itself as strongest in those epochs of the church's history when the Holy Spirit has most strongly influenced the church. Always it has been the increasing wind of the Spirit which has provoked the reaction of "the mystery of iniquity."

But this is not an accurate description of Christianity, or perchance of the church of the nineteenth century. The nihilism of that century is not to be explained simply as an anti-Christian movement, which mysteriously from outside strikes the church, much as a meteor inexplicably falls on a church building. Rather it is the characteristic reaction of the European spirit to a specific failure of the church, namely to the fact that the church has brought suspicion upon itself in that it has betrayed its original aim and in the West become doctrine and theory, in the East a liturgical ceremony, and in its life it has not proved its claim to be the source of charismatic powers of love fulfilling themselves in history. Consequently it is not enough these days to shake one's finger and cry with disturbed countenance, "Nietzsche is the cause of it all!" Western and Eastern nihilism are the inevitable reply and reaction to a distinctive sin of Christendom in East and West, just that sin which Nietzsche correctly characterized as a "euthanasia of Christianity." This euthanasia in the West lay in a development into an external Christianity which consecrated and gave a religious embellishment to all the political and social forms of life, and made of Christianity but a moral cloak for superficial civic respectability. In the East it showed itself as a development into a political state churchism which gave sanction to social injustice, political suppression, and spiritual slavery.

The only way, therefore, in which nihilism can be overcome is that the church itself becomes conscious of its guilt and of its share of responsibility for this historical deterioration, for this devaluation of its charisma, for this failure to discharge its obligation, and for this discrediting of its nature. Was it entirely undeserved that in place of a church which had forfeited its charisma the atheist took over the place of the prophet and turned the dis-

torted mirror of his criticism on the church after it had forgotten ever to renew itself in humility and repentance according to the original message of the Gospel? Only when the church regards this attack of nihilism as a thorn meant especially for itself, as a compulsion inflicted especially for the purpose of evangelical self-analysis, may it rise to the universal viewpoint and see this attack on the Christian doctrine of God and of man as a mystery of the plan of salvation unfolding itself through the counsel of God in the church.

No one has discerned more clearly than Franz von Baader this meaning of nihilism. He called attention to the inner nature of nihilism and in it perceived the share of guilt which the church had as well as "the mystery of iniquity." He pointed out too the fundamental difference between modern nihilism *post Christum* and the nihilism of antiquity *ante Christum,* in the epoch of the collapse of the ancient world in the centuries immediately preceding Christ. He thus writes of this in his address *Concerning the Unity of Intelligence:*

> At the time of the fall of the Roman world-power society seemed destined to complete chaos, and there was indeed ground to doubt that it would again be revived and re-established, because in this apparently God-deserted condition no one was able to believe that the helping and saving God was so close as He yet actually was. In the deepest night He arose over the chaos as the dawn of a new day.
>
> *Now,* however, while the sun still is in the heavens but *at present concealed from our eyes by dark earth-borne mists* it would be a cowardly and unreasonable lack of faith if we surrendered once more to despair and were not able to maintain the courage of that faith which had been based on convictions so often tested and formed in the depths of our religious doctrines. For since the advent of that world-redeeming epoch every new phase of such a seeming increasing remoteness of God, *even if the result of our own guilt,* is designed only to prepare us for a deeper receptivity and consequently for a more glorious manifestation of God. *For thus only the seemingly deepest experience of being forsaken and deserted by God (Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachtani) could realize the most intimate union of God with human nature.*

The Doctrine of Man in the Lutheran Confessions

Jaroslav Pelikan

THE THEOLOGY of the Lutheran Confessions is avowedly theocentric. The Book of Concord begins with the ancient ecumenical confessions of faith in God, and the primary Lutheran confession, the Augustana, also opens with a reiteration of the catholic doctrine of God. All the other doctrinal and ethical matters taken up in the Confessions, including the marriage of priests and the nature of civil government, are to be referred to that theocentric basis.

This is true also and especially of the doctrine of man. Man as a biological, historical, and sociological phenomenon is not the concern of the Confessions. Even when, as in the case of the Formula of Concord, an individual confession begins with the doctrine of man, it wishes to see and to interpret man in the light of his relation to God. At a time when the doctrine of man is once more occupying a central place in theological discussion, the present essay will seek to present a synthetic view of the doctrine of man in the Lutheran Confessions—of man in his relation to God.[1]

The Confessions themselves yield a useful division for such a presentation of the doctrine of man. In attempting to clarify its anthropology, the Formula of Concord distinguishes four conditions of man:[2] his state before the Fall; his relation to God after

1 Of the many discussions of the problem, three in particular have been helpful to me: Werner Elert, *Morphologie des Luthertums*, 2 vols. (Munich: 1931-1932), I, pp. 15-52; Edmund Schlink, *Theologie der evangelisch-lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften*, 2nd ed. (Munich: 1946), pp. 67-104; and Gustav Plitt, *Einleitung in die Augustana*, II (Erlangen: 1868), pp. 103-139.

2 Solida Declaratio, Art. II, par. 2, *Concordia Triglotta* (St. Louis: 1921), p. 881. Henceforth I shall employ the usual abbreviations for the titles of the individual confessions, referring to articles by a Roman numeral and to paragraphs by an Arabic numeral, and shall follow that reference with a page number referring to the *Triglotta*.

the Fall; his natural powers after the Fall; and his relation to God after conversion.

I

Because the principal concern of the Confessions is with man as he is related to God, the doctrine of man which they present is derived from the Word of God. And as the depths of human sin since the Fall cannot be known except by revelation,[3] so it is even more impossible for the unaided human mind to conceive of man's condition as it was before the Fall. The doctrine of the *Urstand* must be based upon revelation.

Central to that revelation of God's original plan for man is the doctrine that man is a creature. The origin of human existence does not lie in man's hands, but in God's. And the existence into which man is called by the creative act of God is an existence *samt allen Kreaturen*.[4] This does not mean merely that God made all creatures, man among them; it means, rather, that man the creation lies in the context of the creation as such, and that man was made to live in affinity with that creation. Thus Luther spoke of man's continuity with the creation in the terror of death, when all creatures join to tell me that I must die and when every leaf reminds me of my fate.[5] Similarly, the New Testament describes the man in Christ as καινὴ κτίσις, "a new creation."[6] For man was created *samt allen Kreaturen,* in the company of all the creatures and so he is to be understood.

For the doctrine of the creation to be a relevant as well as an historical statement, however, there must be some relation be-

3 Sm. Art., Part III, Art. 1, p. 477; cf. also Luther's statement, "De servo arbitrio," *Werke* (Weimar: 1881 ff.; hereafter abbreviated as *WA*), XVIII, 707.

4 Sm. Cat., Creed, Art. I, p. 543. The English "and all creatures" is not an accurate reproduction either of the German "samt" or of the Latin "una cum," both of which stress man's continuity with the whole creation.

5 *Resolutiones disputationum de indulgentiarum virtute, WA,* I, 557; *Enarratio Psalmi XC, WA,* XL-3, 534-535; *Der Prophet Jona ausgelegt, WA,* XIX, 226.

6 On Paul's concept of κτίσις, cf. Rudolf Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments,* I (Tübingen: 1948), pp. 222-226; on the καινὴ κτίσις, pp. 344-345. Johann Haar, *Initium Creaturae Dei* (Gütersloh: 1939) is a thorough discussion of this element in Luther's thought.

tween the *creatio ex nihilo*[7] and the contemporary world, between the man who was formed of the dust of the earth and the man who is born of human parents today. Without ever developing a speculative interpretation of that relation, the Lutheran Confessions assert that "I am a creature of God" (L. Cat., Creed, I, 13, p. 681) and again that "God has created me" (Sm. Cat., p. 543). This assertion, in turn, is the message not of the opening chapters of Genesis, but of Psalm 139. For that reason, when the Formula of Concord—for reasons which will be mentioned later—wants to insist that not merely Adam, but every man is God's creature, it refers to that Psalm, in which it is stated clearly that I am God's creature.[8] For though I am the product of a process which can be biologically analyzed, my coming into being, no less than Adam's, is the result of God's creative act: "Thou hast formed me in my mother's womb."

But the mere assertion that man is a creature does not exhaust the biblical picture of man. The Bible portrays man as created in the image of God, and the doctrine of the *imago Dei* must always be considered alongside the creatureliness of man.[9] How is that image to be interpreted? In keeping with its intellectualism, medieval theology had inclined to the view that the image of God consisted in man's rational capacity.[10] By way of contrast, the Lutheran Confessions, and especially the Apology, insist that the phrase "image of God" be interpreted in a religious way rather than in an intellectualistic or moralistic one (Apo., II, 18, pp. 109-111). The righteousness which God demands is primarily a righteousness of the First Table, a *justitia erga Deum* rather than a mere observance of the prescriptions of the Law (Apo., II, 16-17, p. 109). And though some sixteenth century Lutherans had begun

7 Karl Barth has carefully traced the development of this concept and its relation to the doctrine of man in *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, III-2 (Zurich: 1948), pp. 182-188.

8 F. C., S. D., I, 34-38, pp. 869-871; see also the excellent exposition of Johann Gerhard, *Loci Theologici*, ed. by E. Preuss, 9 vols. (Berlin: 1863 ff.), VII, pp. 269 ff.

9 On the validity of this concept in dogmatics, see the trenchant remarks of Friedrich Karl Schumann, "Imago Dei" in Heinrich Bornkamm (ed.), *Imago Dei. Beiträge zur theologischen Anthropologie* (Giessen: 1932), pp. 167-180.

10 For representative passages from patristic and medieval sources, cf. Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, 2 vols. (New York: 1943), I, pp. 153-154, note 4.

to define the *imago Dei* at least partly in an intellectualist framework,[11] the Confessions, including the Formula of Concord (S. D., I, 10, p. 863), consistently stress the religious character of that phrase. This is true even when they quote church fathers whose doctrine of the *imago Dei* was not altogether free of admixtures of Greek rationalism.[12] Creation, then, is always creation by God. Original righteousness, the image of God, is also by God and in the sight of God.

II

Because of the emphasis they put on the religious character of original righteousness and of the image of God, the Lutheran Confessions interpret sin, too, as a religious rather than principally a moral phenomenon.[13] But in attempting to articulate this, they were confronted by the traditional definitions of sin in the medieval church. According to medieval theology, sin consisted of a *carentia justitiae originalis* and of *concupiscentia,* both of which could be—and were—interpreted in a moralistic way.[14] As in other areas of theology, so in the definition of sin, the Reformers utilized the definitions that were current in the sixteenth century, but gave them a new meaning. Thus, *carentia justitiae originalis* is interpreted as the inability to come into a proper relation with God,[15]

11 See, for example, Tileman Hesshusius, *Examen theologicum,* 2nd ed. (Frankfort: 1578), p. 28, on the *imago* as a *lux et sapientia in mente.* Martin Chemnitz, on the other hand, saw the *imago in tota mente, toto corde, tota voluntate, in omnibus membris corporis, et potentiis animae. Examen Concilii Tridentini,* ed. by E. Preuss (Leipzig: 1915), p. 103. See also Matthias Hafenreffer, *Loci theologici,* 2nd ed. (Tübingen: 1601), pp. 72-78, where *imago Dei* follows a discussion of immortality.

12 In the passage from Ambrose quoted by the Apology, II, 19, p. 111, the larger context explicitly refers to *mentis vigore: Hexaemeron,* ed. by R. O. Gilbert, *Bibliotheca Patrum Ecclesiasticorum,* IX (Leipzig: 1840), Bk. VI, ch. viii, par. 45, p. 167.

13 Cf. Gustaf Aulén's discussion of "Sin as a Religious Concept," *The Faith of the Christian Church* (Philadelphia: 1948), pp. 260-261.

14 "Original sin is concupiscence materially, but the privation of original justice formally," Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica,* I-II, Q. 82, Art. 3, *Basic Writings,* ed. by Anton C. Pegis (New York: 1945), II, p. 676. It is interesting that the distinction between the *formale* and the *materiale* of sin, scorned by the Apology (II, 4, p. 105), soon returned to Lutheran theology; cf., for one example, Johann Spangenberg, *Margarita theologica, continens praecipuos locos doctrinae Christianae* (Frankfort: 1557), pp. 20-21.

15 Apo., II, 23, p. 111: "the ancient definition says precisely the same thing that we say." On *carentia,* see also F. C., S. D., I, 10, p. 863, and Gerhard, *Loci,* II, pp. 159-160. Spangenberg, *op. cit.,* p. 19, also interprets the Anselmic concept of *carentia* this way.

and *concupiscentia* becomes synonymous with the egocentricity which is rebellion against God.[16] *Justitia originalis* is always *erga Deum—peccatum originale* is always *erga Deum.* In this sense at least, Emil Brunner's insistence that the sinner is always a sinner "in the sight of God" is in keeping with the theology of the Lutheran Confessions.[17]

But sin is a religious fact for the Confessions in a far more vivid sense than the negative statement "lack of the proper relation to God" might indicate. Sin also has its positive side. It is subjection to the wrath of God, and that wrath is real. Like the New Testament,[18] the Confessions take the wrath of God seriously.[19] They refuse to rationalize it, as did seventeenth century Orthodoxy, but see the wrath of God at work in all the enemies to whom man is now subject as a result of sin.[20] For sin is slavery to the devil (Apo., II, 46-50, pp. 117-119). It is death; and as a dead man cannot rise of his own accord, so a sinner cannot become alive by his own efforts (F. C., S. D., II, 11, p. 885). Over against the attempts to interpret sin as merely a fatal disease which can kill a man if left unchecked, the Formula of Concord emphasized that sin is death itself. There is good New Testament background for such usage.[21] Sin is bondage, and man is enslaved by sin. Sin is so deep a corruption that only the revelation of God can uncover its ultimate meaning (F. C., S. D., I, 8, p. 861; I, 60, p. 879).

And yet even the sinner remains the creature of God. Whatever the Confessions assert concerning the depth of sin and the bondage to the devil must be set in dialectical relation to their

16 Apo., II, 26, p. 111; cf. Wilhelm Braun, *Die Bedeutung der Concupiscenz in Luthers Leben und Lehre* (Berlin: 1908) for a complete discussion.

17 Emil Brunner, *Man in Revolt,* tr. by Olive Wyon (Philadelphia: 1947), pp. 169 ff.

18 Günther Bornkamm, "Die Offenbarung des Zornes Gottes," *Zeitschrift für die neustestamentliche Wissenschaft,* XXXIV (1935-1936), pp. 239-262.

19 Apo., IV, 36-40, p. 131, and *passim;* see also Elert, *op. cit.,* pp. 31-39, on the entire development.

20 Cf. Gerhard, *Loci,* I, p. 349, on *ira Dei* as anthropomorphic, with approving reference to the scholastic doctrine of divine apathy!

21 It is enlightening to note the results when a New Testament scholar addresses himself to the theology of the Confessions; see the recent essay of my colleague, Martin Franzmann, "Augustana II: Of Original Sin," *Concordia Theological Monthly,* XX (1949), pp. 881-893, esp. pp. 890 ff.

continued insistence that God is the Creator also of the sinner. This is the intention underlying the Aristotelian distinction between *substantia* and *accidens* introduced in Article I of the Formula.[22] Whatever it is that makes a man a man and a creature of God (*substantia*) remains even after the Fall. In support of this contention, the Formula cites a number of doctrines which would be materially affected by a contrary teaching (S. D., I, 34-47, pp. 869-875). Of particular interest in that catalogue is Christology (par. 43-44, p. 873). For if human nature as it is now constituted is a creature of the devil, then the doctrine of Christ faces two alternatives, both of them disastrous: to maintain that Christ's human nature was a creation of the devil; or to maintain that Christ's human nature was not the nature that is common to men.[23] Since either of these alternatives would have destroyed the meaning of the Incarnation, the authors of the Formula rejected the thesis that sin has become the *substantia* of man, insisting that in spite of sin man's *substantia,* his creatureliness, remains. Though they were not blind to the fact that the distinction of *substantia* and *accidens* could lead to the Roman Catholic distinction of *pura naturalia* and *donum superadditum* (F. C., S. D., I, 29, p. 867), they were nevertheless intent upon safeguarding the creatorhood of God and the true human nature of Christ.

Whenever original sin is discussed, one problem inevitably arises: how is original sin transmitted? St. Augustine had answered the question with a doctrine of seminal transmission, asserting, at least in certain writings, that a man is born sinful because he is the product of the sexual union of a man and a woman.[24] Carrying this point of view even farther, Thomas Aquinas had taught that if only Eve had sinned, but not Adam, sin would not have been transmitted to their descendants, since transmitted char-

22 F. C., S. D., I, 54-62, pp. 877-879; on the entire controversy that brought this forth, see Wilhelm Preger, *Matthias Flacius Illyricus und seine Zeit* (Erlangen: 1859-1861), II, pp. 310-412.

23 Cf. Martin Chemnitz, *De duabus naturis in Christo* (Leipzig: 1580), pp. 33-35, on the latter.

24 Benjamin B. Warfield, "Augustine and the Pelagian Controversies," in *Two Studies in the History of Doctrine* (New York: 1897), pp. 128-129, has collected Augustine's various theories of transmission and imputation.

acteristics are carried only by the father. For this reason, Jesus was born sinless in spite of the fact—it will be remembered that Thomas did not teach the immaculate conception of Mary—that He was born of a sinful mother.[25] The Confessions devote relatively little attention to this entire issue. The statement of the Augsburg Confession (II, 1, p. 43), that all men *so natürlich geboren werden* are sinful, is, as Vilmar points out, "essentially Christological."[26] It does not so much posit an explanation of how sin is transmitted as exclude Christ from the predicate which follows. Following biblical usage, the Formula of Concord employs the word "seed" in its discussion of original sin (S. D., I, 7, p. 861); but it does not involve itself in the problematics referred to above. Indeed, the emphasis of the Confessions upon the resurrection of the body[27] stands in sharp contrast to the Greek "spiritualism" of medieval theology, and, consequently, to its definition of sin as sensuality.

III

From what has been said so far about the nature of sin according to the Confessions, the suspicion might arise that their doctrine of man is completely deterministic, and that they deny man all freedom of choice. There was, as a matter of fact, some ground for such a suspicion. The Renaissance had revived interest in the classical discussions of free will and determinism,[28] and Luther had shown himself willing to use pagan fatalism as supplementary proof for his doctrine of the bondage of the will.[29] Melanchthon,

25 *Summa Theologica,* I-II, Q. 81, Art. 5, *Basic Writings,* II, pp. 671-672.

26 A. F. C. Vilmar, *Die Augsburgische Confession* (Gütersloh: 1870), p. 51.

27 L. Cat., Creed, III, 57-60, pp. 693-695; also the work of a co-author of the Formula, David Chytraeus, *De morte et vita aeterna* (Wittenberg: 1581), pp. 195-196, defending the resurrection against the scholastic doctrine of immortality.

28 Cf. Lorenzo Valla's "Dialogue on Free Will," tr. by Charles Edward Trinkaus in Ernst Cassirer et al. (ed.), *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man* (Chicago: 1948), pp. 155-182.

29 "De servo arbitrio," *WA* XVIII, 618, 718, 786; but see also "Quaestio de viribus et voluntate hominis sine gratia" (1516), *WA* I, 145-151; and "Quaestio theologica de naturali potentia voluntatis hominis" (1520), *WA* VI, 31. The entire problem is given penetrating analysis by Rudolf Hermann, *Zu Luthers Lehre vom unfreien Willen* (Berlin and Leipzig: 1931).

on the other hand, had been deeply concerned with the problem of freedom and natural morality.[30] Because of all this, the Confessions found it necessary to distinguish their doctrine of the bondage of the will from mechanistic determinism.

Such a distinction became all the more necessary because of the controversy with Flacius Illyricus. Seeing the gradual growth of natural theology as an opening wedge for a more optimistic interpretation of human capacity, Flacius sought to defend Luther's doctrine of sin by rejecting the natural knowledge of God.[31] By a syllogism strangely parallel to that of Karl Barth,[32] Flacius believed such a rejection to be the only conclusion consistent with Luther's doctrine of man. In opposing Flacius' reasoning, the Formula of Concord teaches that man has a certain degree of knowledge about God and the Law.[33] But it does not try, as did the later dogmaticians, to construct an entire "natural theology," buttressed with all manner of metaphysical proofs for the existence of God.[34] It merely posits some knowledge of God and of the Law.

On this latter point, the knowledge of the Law, the earlier Confessions have something more to say. Man has the freedom, says the Augsburg Confession, to choose from among the things which reason can grasp.[35] That is to say, man cannot choose between those things which are subject to reason and those which are not; but given the area of actions over which reason has control, man can decide which he will accept and which he will reject.

30 See the summaries of Melanchthon's development in Hans Engelland, *Melanchthon, Glauben und Handeln* (Munich: 1931), pp. 80-90 and 237-258, with full source references.

31 Preger, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 212-214.

32 On this parallel, see the interesting comments about Flacius in the latest volume of Barth's dogmatics, which is devoted to the doctrine of man: *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, III-2, pp. 29-32.

33 See the summary in Schlink, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-86.

34 On this development, see the writer's essay, "Natural Theology in David Hollaz," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, XVIII (1947), pp. 253-263, where bibliographical references are given; on the doctrine of man in this connection, see esp. pp. 258-259.

35 XVIII, 1, p. 51, German text: *zu wählen unter den Dingen, so die Vernunft begreift.* Cf. the exposition of Jacob Heerbrand, *Compendium theologiae* (Wittenberg: 1582), pp. 224-232; in connection with the trend indicated in note 11 above, it is significant that Heerbrand equates *arbitrium* with *intellectus, mens vel ratio*, p. 224.

As a result, those who have applied reason to the solution of human problems have frequently produced admirable answers to ethical problems. Indeed, "Aristotle wrote concerning civil morals so learnedly that nothing further concerning this need be demanded" (Apo., IV, 14, p. 123). For the area of civil morals is subject to reason, and the Apology explicitly and repeatedly expresses its high praise of civil morals and its deep concern for their preservation, even apart from faith (Apo., IV, 22-24, p. 127).

In the realm of nature, then, the human will may be said to be free to choose between alternative courses of action. But since faith and the right relation to God cannot be subject to reason—for faith is above nature (Apo., III, 182, p. 205)—this freedom to choose has no bearing upon faith. Even though a man's free will *in naturalibus* may lead him to hear the Word, this cannot be construed as proof that he is free to choose God (F. C., S. D., II, 24, p. 891; par. 53, pp. 901-903). On this point Article II of the Formula is very insistent, even though it is equally insistent in its rejection of Stoic determinism.

IV

Although the human will is hostile to God and although it cannot cooperate with God, yet God makes willing persons out of unwilling ones (F. C., Ep., II, 17, p. 791) and draws men to Him. Our discussion would not be complete without at least a brief presentation of man in the state of grace according to the Lutheran Confessions.

The teaching of the Confessions on this point can be summarized in the dictum of Luther: *simul justus et peccator . . . justus in spe, peccator in re.*[36] Man is *justus in spe* because the *justitia* which he has is a *justitia aliena*, it is the *justitia Christi.*[37] A great deal of discussion was required in the sixteenth century before this

36 The classic exposition of this dictum is that of Rudolf Hermann, *Luthers These 'Gerecht und Sünder zugleich'* (Gütersloh: 1930). Also of great value is the work of Erdmann Schott, *Fleisch und Geist nach Luthers Lehre* (Leipzig: 1928).

37 Cf. Aegidius Hunnius, *Articulus de justificatione hominus* (Frankfort: 1590), pp. 19-20, p. 63, on imputation.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

insight was clarified.[38] The controversy which has centered around a crucial passage in the Apology indicates the scope of that discussion.[39] The relation between justification and sanctification in Melanchthon's theology had gradually been obscured by his intellectualistic definition of faith.[40] In opposition to that definition, Andreas Osiander set an interpretation of justification in which the tension of *simul justus et paccator* was resolved by reference to a mystic union between Christ and the believer. Because the antithesis between Melanchthon's intellectualism and Osiander's mysticism presented two alternatives, both of them false, the Formula of Concord very precisely defined the nature of the *justitia* in *justificatio* (S. D., III, 54-56, pp. 933-935). It ruled out all notions of perfection, for, as the Apology had maintained, the Christian is *justus in spe* even after Baptism.[41] But the Formula also warns that this fact dare not be used as a pretext for an "Epicurean life" (Ep., XI, 9, p. 833) or for carnal security.

For while the Christian is *justus in spe,* he is at the same time *peccator in re.*[42] And the sinner is one who needs repentance and forgiveness. Thus, the doctrine of *simul justus et peccator* is not a pretext for carnal security, but quite the opposite. The realization that sin is ever present, even in the Christian, and that the righteousness once given in justification must also be actualized in the Christian life, is a dynamic for the continued use of the means of grace and for the "exercise" of faith (Apo., III, 68-72, p. 175). It is also a stimulant to the Christian hope; for just as the Kingdom is still *tectum cruce* (Apo., VII-VIII, 18, p. 233), so

38 See the summary of the entire development in Otto Ritschl, *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus,* II-1 (Leipzig: 1912), pp. 455-500.

39 Apo., IV, 72, p. 141. From the voluminous literature on this passage I cite two works which summarize the preceding discussion: Carl Stange, "Uber eine Stelle in der Apologie. Ein Beitrag zur Rechtfertigungslehre der Apologie," in his *Theologische Aufsätze* (Leipzig: 1905), pp. 50-73; and Johann Kunze, "Die Rechtfertigungslehre in der Apologie," *Beiträge zur Forderung christlicher Theologie,* V (1908).

40 Engelland's entire book, referred to in note 30 above, is a profound critique of that relation in Melanchthon's theology; see especially his summary comments, pp. 483-525.

41 Apo., II, 35-37, pp. 113-115; cf. Chemnitz, *Examen,* pp. 105-107.

42 Schott, *op. cit.,* pp. 54-56.

also the Christian life has only the first fruits of the Spirit (F. C., S. D., II, 68, p. 907) and is based upon an eschatological hope.[43]

In this hope, indeed, may be comprehended the entire doctrine of man in the Lutheran Confessions. As man was created *samt allen Kreaturen,* so, too, he is redeemed in the context of the total creation; for Christ died for the world, not only for the church (F. C., S. D., XI, 28, p. 1071). As man's sin is always against God, so, too, he hopes for liberation from sin and death and the devil by the victory of God over these enemies. And as the Christian perceives the incompleteness of his dedication to God, he hopes for deliverance from *simul justus et peccator* and the ultimate restoration of *semper justus.*

43 On Luther's use of *spes,* see, for example, the passages cited by Karl Holl, "Die Rechtfertigungslehre in Luthers Vorlesung über den Römerbrief," *Gesammelte Aufsätze,* I, *Luther,* 7th ed. (Tübingen: 1948), pp. 144-145.

Lutheran Pastoral Care in America Today[1]

C. Charles Bachmann

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH always has emphasized pastoral care, although certain phases of it have been overlooked and neglected—sometimes taken for granted. Traditionally the Lutheran clergyman has been called *pastor* because of his unique office as the shepherd of his flock and the *seelsorger,* which may be translated as physician of the soul. The new and increasing demands of life today make it imperative that the Lutheran Church study the contribution it has made and can make through pastoral care to its people. By intensive research and pastoral participation in this field the Lutheran Church can discover even more of the needs of individuals and groups and by doing so it can minister more adequately to them. Laymen, conscious of this growing need for more adequate pastoral care, can support their pastors by providing an opportunity for them to take advanced training now available in the field of pastoral care.

In order to discover the existing patterns of Lutheran pastoral care of the present era in America and to supplement the meager material on the subject, the writer sent 494 questionnaires by mail to a cross-section[2] of Lutheran pastors in the eight bodies of the National Lutheran Council and the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. Of these, 213 or 43 per cent responded. The questionnaire was divided into three parts. I. Concepts of Pastoral Care (eleven

1 This article is based on the doctoral dissertation, *The Development of Lutheran Pastoral Care in America,* completed by the writer at Boston University in 1949.

2 From the statistical reports found in the 1948 yearbooks of the nine church bodies it was possible to make a selection of pastors according to the numerical strength and distribution of parishes in cities, towns, and rural areas. To achieve a representative sample of the Lutheran Church in America pastors of all Lutheran areas in the nation were included.

questions); II. Methods of Pastoral Care (seventeen questions); III. Appraisal of Modern Trends (nine questions).

The respondents by their answers to the first section on concepts clearly indicated that Lutheran pastors think in the traditional pattern that pastoral care is *seelsorge,* which is best translated as "the care of souls," and that it is primarily a ministry to individuals, though not necessarily concerned with the religious aspects of the parishioners' problems. The implication is that the Lutheran pastor of today senses the importance of ministering to the whole person—body, mind, and spirit. From this then, we conclude that the term *pastoral care* may be defined in its primary meaning as a personal ministry to individuals—to the whole personality; in a more general sense, the term applies to all of the activities of the pastor.

It was Martin Luther who set the traditional pattern of pastoral care for the Lutheran Church. He held as a primary concept of the pastoral office the necessity for the physician to heal himself before he could heal others. "Physician, heal thyself!" (Luke 4:23). He felt that a pastor should first search his own soul, advise and care for it, before seeking to give such care to others.

The Reformer thought that the *seelsorger* had to be initiated into the mysteries of the divine Word. It was this immersion into the Word and his own personal prayer life which made Luther's pastoral ministry so effective. He relied heavily upon spiritual resources in his pastoral care. Luther's use of spiritual resources is especially evident in the voluminous letters written to individuals in distress and in the records which reveal that his pastoral help was widely sought.

Luther recognized that there was a relationship between bodily diseases and the spiritual condition. This is the underlying principle in the modern psychosomatic approach in medicine. On the American scene Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, the outstanding pastor of the Colonial Period, anticipated the psychosomatic approach even more than Luther. The correlation between bodily health and the soul's condition was an idea Muhlenberg had first

heard in the University of Halle in Germany. In order to win men they first had to be understood. The case history method was used and "soul analysis" was practiced.

According to John N. Ritter, Muhlenberg knew "that in order to cure the soul a pastor had to be able to cure the body, or at best understand the disfunctions of the body that hindered the development. . . ."[3] If one reads the *Journals* of Muhlenberg, with the psychosomatic approach in mind, he will realize that Muhlenberg was cognizant of this principle. He certainly considered the functioning of the whole man and, in this respect, he was well in advance of his age. In the opinion of the writer, effective soul-therapy can be practiced only if there is an understanding of the composite whole: body, mind, and spirit. A pastor's understanding of the psychic reactions upon the bodily function is essential in providing the best in pastoral care.

The exigencies of today's mechanized life make individuals' problems more complex, thus increasing the demands for qualitative pastoral care. In this age we are confronted with an abundance of personality disorders and it is imperative that pastors give primary consideration to the day-to-day ministry to individuals. Surprisingly enough, over half of the pastors responding to the questionnaire consider preaching more significant than counseling, which is one of the most important aspects of pastoral care. Traditionally Lutheran clergymen are called *pastors* but the present emphasis indicates that they consider pastoral care secondary to preaching.

On the other hand, in the section of the questionnaire on methods, most of the pastors find their pastoral opportunities as a result of calling. Only 22 per cent find their pastoral opportunities through preaching. This suggests a discrepancy between the basic concept of Lutheran pastoral care—care to individual souls—and methods.

In the marginal notes one pastor wrote, "Pastoral visitation is the chief task of the pastor and is often crowded out by every-

3 John N. Ritter, "Muhlenberg's Anticipation of Psychosomatic Medicine," *Lutheran Church Quarterly,* Vol. 19 (1946), p. 186.

thing else because it can be pushed aside with the least amount of audible objection." Dr. Paul Scherer, one of the outstanding Lutheran preachers in America today, said in his Yale lectures[4] on preaching that there is no substitute for pastoral calling even in a large city parish, such as in New York City where he formerly had been pastor. He also encouraged counseling in his office for those who wanted to see him at particular times. He prepared for these interviews by intensive study of psychology and psychiatry so that he would know at what point he was able to help and at what point he should make referrals.

According to the Lutheran tradition, pastoral calling is one of the chief duties of the pastor. It should not be neglected but made systematically and consistently. It cannot be sporadic and be successful. One of our best examples of the home-going pastor is Muhlenberg who tirelessly devoted himself to the care of souls. Lutheran pastors of today have indicated that they do most of their personal counseling in the homes of their parishioners.

There is one notable difference, however, between Muhlenberg and pastors of today. Muhlenberg kept accurate accounts of his pastoral visits and in many cases these accounts were verbatim records of the interviews. For this reason, among others, pastors can profit greatly by studying Muhlenberg's *Journals*. Many pastors in this era do keep records but few are as complete as those of Muhlenberg. Perhaps pastors consider their interviews too personal to record. On the other hand, keeping of records is of utmost importance if the pastor is to have specific knowledge about the people he has visited and their problems as well as their needs. Either summary or verbatim records of visits will give the pastor an opportunity to review, evaluate, and criticize his own technique and make progress in his efforts to help others.

The specific method of counseling used in pastoral care is becoming increasingly important. Looking back to Luther's pastoral ministry to individuals, we discover that he was often *directive,* that is, he assumed that it was his responsibility to find out

4 Paul Scherer, *For We Have This Treasure* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1943), pp. 22-25.

the cause of the person's difficulty or distress and suggest remedies. He was inclined to choose the goals toward which he expected the individual to progress. Muhlenberg also was directive at times. Often he led his people to a change of heart by first leading them into despair. While his approach offered much hope it also held attending dangers because of creating more anxiety than could be resolved.

In contrast, the majority of the respondents to the questionnaire *think* their method of counseling is responsive and yet no significant number have been influenced by Dr. Paul E. Johnson who introduced the term "responsive counseling"[5] (permissive atmosphere with sympathetic responses by the counselor; mutual responsibility for progress). In this type of counseling the parishioner chooses his own goals, makes his own decisions, and does most of the talking about his problem. The pastor, however, is not a passive listener but by his responses and attitude is actually feeling into the situation. By reflecting the parishioner's mood and the feeling content expressed the pastor helps his parishioner to help himself.

There is an inherent tendency among pastors to steal the ball of conversation before it is thrown to them and to accept the major responsibility in solving problems. Too often the pastor considers himself one who gives advice (which should not be confused with giving information) rather than one who counsels. It is easier for him to suggest a course of action than to deliberate together with the parishioner over a longer period of time. Responsive counseling is a difficult discipline for it demands concentrated effort and mental integrity all during the course of the interview as the pastor listens with empathy, which means feeling into the situation.

It is especially important that an empathetic relationship be employed in the care of the sick. Traditionally Lutheran pastors have been faithful in the care of the sick, although most of them have had little training for the special problems involved. Many pastors have missed their opportunities in the sick room by domi-

5 See Paul E. Johnson, "Clinical Psychology for the Pastor," *Journal of Clinical Psychology,* Vol. I (1945), pp. 264-265.

nating the situation without giving attention to the patient's needs, thus disturbing the patient and incurring the wrath of the medical profession. For example, prayer in itself has a therapeutic value in the drama of healing but sometimes there has been indiscriminate use of prayer in the sick room. The Rev. Rollin J. Fairbanks, Chaplain at Massachusetts General Hospital, has called this practice "promiscuous praying."

The majority of Lutheran pastors responding to the questionnaire *always* pray in hospital visits. Some noted that it would be a serious omission to leave the sick room without at least asking if the patient desires prayer. Several of the pastors follow the general rule of praying when the patient is ill but omitting the prayer when the patient has recovered.

Schindler, in his writing on the pastoral care of the sick,[6] was cognizant of the procedures used today in hospitals and in visitation of the sick. (1) Part of the Lutheran pastor's task is to interpret the hospital setting to the patient. The aura of mystery that pervades the immaculate surroundings is often bewildering and frightening. (2) The pastor will consider the patient as a person who has certain fears, frustrations, and needs. The pastor who is calm in his manner and sympathetic in his approach will go a long way toward alleviating some of the distractions of the sick whether in the home or in the hospital. (3) The administration of the Lord's Supper to patients who are to undergo surgery is a real source of help to those who are experiencing this period of crisis. "The words of Scripture or the most earnest prayer may be forgotten in great pain or long discomfort, but the Holy Communion is a concrete fact which the patient can remember." (4) The length of the visit usually should be of short duration. (5) It is not always necessary to have Scripture and prayer. The visit may assume a more friendly nature if the introduction of Scripture and prayer would be forced or artificial.

In their ministry to the bereaved, Lutheran pastors give comfort through God's Word. Some avoid emotional conversation and

6 Carl J. Schindler, *The Pastor as a Personal Counselor* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1942), pp. 100-101.

tears while others encourage conversation about the deceased. The survey results indicate that Lutheran pastors do not follow the modern emphasis in "grief work," as psychiatrists call it. Lutheran writers have made no extensive mention of the type of grief work that is practiced by Lutheran pastors or the type which should be practiced. Most of the reference in grief work has been to the funeral customs and the part the pastor will take in the burial service. The Rev. George Arbaugh, Ph.D., however, has said that it is most important to call on the bereaved and to encourage them, with a sympathetic attitude, to talk about the deceased.

The Rev. William Rogers, Ph.D., in his thesis, *The Place of Grief Work in Mental Health*, has made some helpful suggestions drawn from the work of Dr. Erich Lindemann, Chief of Psychiatry at Massachusetts General Hospital, the Rev. Rollin J. Fairbanks, and Miss Ina May Greer, Research Associate to Dr. Lindemann. Dr. Rogers considered the following important needs of the bereaved: (1) the support from others, (2) the acceptance of the pain of bereavement, (3) the expression of sorrow and the sense of loss, (4) need to verbalize feelings of hostility and guilt, (5) catharsis to remove fear of insanity, (6) emancipation from the deceased, (7) need of security, (8) satisfaction in the acceptance by others, (9) forming new relationships, (10) unity of experience which is common to all men, (11) purpose in life, (12) above all to be treated as a person. It is in the interaction of personalities on each other that the pastor can help by allowing the bereaved to express his grief without shame and without pity.

One of the most important pastoral acts of the Lutheran pastor is the performance of the marriage service. Before performing the marriage ceremony the Lutheran pastor is alert to problems, especially those which may result from illegal age, an inter-faith marriage, or a hasty marriage. These three problems have been emphasized by Lutheran pastors who have written or lectured on the marriage act in pastoral theology.

Pastors have excellent opportunities to do pre-marital counseling—when the couples indicate that they are contemplating marriage. Eighty-nine per cent of the pastors responding to the

questionnaire do engage in pre-marital counseling, other than at the wedding rehearsal. Family worship, the marriage service, the wedding rehearsal, and church membership are included in the pre-marital interviews by a large majority of the respondents. Only half of the pastors talk with the couples about the emotional adjustments of marriage. The more delicate and controversial subject of sexual adjustment is carefully avoided. Some pastors, according to their written comments, think that couples should talk about sex with their physician and make this referral. Others give the couples books which cover the subject.

Problems resulting from marital difficulties, more than any other type of problem, are confronted by Lutheran pastors today. This emphasizes the importance of pre-marital counseling in order to prevent, or to lessen, the emotional conflicts which would precipitate marital difficulties later.

In the pastoral care of the children in the parish, several techniques are employed. Many pastors converse individually with the children. Others make it a practice to have private interviews with confirmands. Individual work with children is of primary importance in pastoral care to youth and the results of the survey show that Lutheran pastors are cognizant of this.

The majority of pastors participate both in children's educational activities and in their recreational activities. By teaching in the church school, by conducting confirmation classes, and by guiding the educational and recreational activities in the youth program the pastor is not only actively ministering to the youth groups but he is also laying the ground work for his private ministry to the children. His entire ministry to the children, in a sense, is preventive therapy.

Pastoral care of the aged is becoming increasingly important and demanding because American people are living to an older age today. Most Lutheran pastors visit the aged periodically and administer communion to them. Some pastors try to introduce friends to the aged to supplement lonely hours with companionship.

Other techniques, though practiced rarely, could improve the effectiveness in pastoral care of the aged. Some of the possibilities

are: to encourage hobbies and travel, to find suitable homes, and to introduce organizations for the aged, all of which would alleviate some of the distresses of old age. It would be desirable if pastors could organize an "Over 60 Club" through which the aged could share their memories without feeling the terrible isolation that so often accompanies old age.

Judging from the results of the survey, Lutheran pastors encounter the whole gamut of human experience within their pastoral ministry. As mentioned above, problems resulting from marital difficulties come to the attention of Lutheran pastors more than any other, though problems resulting from worry and anxiety run a close second. It is disturbing to note that 35 per cent of the pastors counsel people who have psychoses. This is a dangerous practice and may lead to untold difficulties. The writer concluded that these pastors must have counseled mild forms of psychoses or that the pastors did not have enough training to be able to recognize psychotic symptoms, which indicated referral to a psychiatrist.

Sixty-five per cent of the pastors responding to the questionnaire practice inter-professional cooperation with doctors but only one-fourth of the respondents use the services of psychiatrists. Because good psychiatrists are not available in all areas and, if available, their fees are often prohibitive, some of the pastors may not find it possible to recommend psychiatric help. The services of social workers are also helpful to many pastors and, in some cases, lawyers can give aid. Each pastor, then, should become acquainted with the types of services available within his community and should foster inter-professional cooperation by initiating a working relationship.

Thus far we have discovered that Lutheran pastors are faithful in their execution of the pastoral tasks. To improve pastoral techniques, however, new trends of pastoral care must be studied, evaluated, and adopted. The modern emphasis on clinical pastoral training is a notable medium through which pastoral care can be strengthened and improved. In contrast to the old idea of separating theory from field work, clinical training unites education and

work so that students and pastors may "learn by doing." Clinical training has been carried on in controlled situations such as may be found in hospitals and other institutions, in which the student-pastor ministers to the patients and receives constructive criticisms on verbatim reports of his interviews. The student-pastor first criticizes and evaluates his own interview to discover what he did, what he should have done, and what he should do next to improve. The supervising chaplain or teacher then reads both the interview and the self-analysis and makes critical comments and suggestions for further development and growth. Clinical seminars, comparable to those in the medical profession, are held so that the group may benefit from the pastoral experience.

It was learned through the responses to the third section of the questionnaire study that most Lutheran pastors have not had clinical training at a recognized center. The majority of the pastors, if the opportunity were given, would take advanced training in a clinical center. Marginal notes indicate that time away from their parishes would be difficult to arrange, unless the pastors would forego their own vacation periods. Pastor and people would benefit if provision could be made to give the pastor a short leave (at least six weeks) for clinical training.

The Rev. Granger E. Westberg, Chaplain of Augustana Hospital in Chicago, offers three types of clinical training courses in pastoral counseling and ministry to the sick for theological students, parish pastors, and chaplains. One course is The Five-Day Seminar which is introductory to the field of clinical pastoral care. The Six-Week Seminar and The Three-Month Pastoral Internship are programs of intensive training. Academic credit for this training may be applied toward the B.D. or S.T.M. degree at Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary at Maywood.

In general, Lutheran seminaries teach the theory of pastoral theology and make some practical application. In most of the Lutheran seminaries the students become assistants or youth leaders in the large city churches, affording some practical experience but no clinical training. The location of the Lutheran seminaries scattered over the nation should make it possible for students to take

advantage of many clinical opportunities provided by general hospitals, mental hospitals, prisons, reformatories, social agencies, etc. They could then translate these new approaches into their own pastoral ministries.

On the basis of the research in conjunction with the writing of the dissertation on Lutheran pastoral care, the writer has formulated the following proposals for consideration by the Lutheran Church in America:

(1) Cooperation of All Lutheran Church Bodies in Re-Studying Lutheran Pastoral Care

In recent years there has been wider cooperation among all Lutherans, especially in Service Centers, the Armed Forces, and in student work. This cooperation of Lutherans in America can be extended into many other areas of pastoral care.

A commission with representative leaders in pastoral care from each of the eight church bodies in the National Lutheran Council and from the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod could study and lay the foundations for further cooperative ventures. Through a comprehensive study of the entire field of pastoral care in the Lutheran Church of America and in other Protestant denominations this Commission on Pastoral Care would be prepared to make specific recommendations to each of the nine Lutheran bodies. The members of the Commission would study the training programs and facilities of seminaries in all denominations to provide the necessary information for establishing adequate training programs in Lutheran seminaries.

Group seminars sponsored by this Commission on Pastoral Care throughout the United States would give Lutheran pastors an opportunity to discuss together present methods of pastoral care in Lutheran churches and to appraise methods used by other denominations. Trained leaders in the field would stimulate interest.

(2) Coordination of Pastoral Theology and Clinical Training in Lutheran Seminaries

The results of the survey indicate that Lutheran pastors favor a psychological counselor to seminarians. Such a psychological

counselor could be of great assistance in screening candidates for the ministry through the use of psychological tests. He would counsel the candidates in their personal adjustments in preparing for the ministry. In this way, the counselor would be in a position to help the seminarians help themselves as they assess their own growth.

The psychological counselor could be the teacher of courses in pastoral psychology and pastoral counseling, which are important phases of pastoral theology. Through these courses the seminarians would learn the concepts and methods of pastoral care. The counselor-teacher would correlate the theory and the practice of pastoral care by assigning the seminarians to clinical centers—institutions or parishes where they would be supervised by trained counselors. Through verbatim reports of interviews the students would learn to criticize and evaluate their own methods of pastoral care and would learn counseling by experience.

(3) Graduate Study in Pastoral Care

According to the survey results, Lutheran pastors think that the Lutheran boards of education should encourage graduate study in the field of pastoral care. Lutheran pastors are recognizing the need for advancing beyond the present development of Lutheran pastoral care by learning new pastoral skills. The Lutheran Church can make a contribution to the entire field of pastoral care by developing the relevance of Lutheran theology to religious therapy and by consummating a union between Lutheran theology and Lutheran pastoral care.

(4) Lutheran Clinical Centers

The writer recommends that the suggested Commission on Pastoral Care promote the establishment of centers in institutions and parishes for clinical pastoral training. The Lutheran Church has many institutions of mercy and parishes located near Lutheran seminaries which would facilitate the training programs for pastors and seminarians. Until such time as these clinical centers are established by the Lutheran Church it is imperative that Lutheran

pastors and seminarians take advantage of training offered in recognized clinical centers.

Institutions are readily adaptable to programs of clinical training. A study of the existing clinical centers would point the way to adopting methods and procedures in clinical pastoral training, so that seminarians and pastors could learn the inter-departmental structure and functions of the institutions, minister to the sick and the dying, all under supervision.

Lutheran churches which have a large membership and a clinically trained pastor could function as a clinical center for training seminarians and pastors. The verbatim records of their interviews could be criticized and evaluated by the pastor-supervisor. A program of group therapy in the parish would provide additional experience as well as meet the needs of the parishioners.

The Commission on Pastoral Care could establish uniform standards for all Lutheran clinical centers. It could aid the centers in calling qualified men, in outlining courses of study, and publicizing the training programs. The Lutheran Church can utilize its own facilities to further the development of Lutheran pastoral care in America.

Christian Mysticism in the Poetry of Lamartine

Gerhard C. Hasenauer

"Tout ce qui n'est pas Dieu n'est rien, n'est qu'un délire."

IN THE YEARS following the French Revolution of 1789 there was in France a marked sterility and lull in all literary activity, especially in poetry. But at the turn of the new century—the nineteenth—literature began to show a rebirth. First of all, the French novelist, Chateaubriand, continued and developed the works of Rousseau and Bernardin de Saint-Pierre—two writers of the eighteenth century—and soon shaped a literary movement—romanticism. Chateaubriand, whose influence as a man of letters was far-reaching and manifold, affected among the numerous writers of his time Alphonse de Lamartine. He, Lamartine, was the first important poet of the nineteenth century in French literature, and the one who felt the force of this novelist's philosophy chiefly because the works of this writer were his favorite readings. It was Chateaubriand's power of imagination, love of nature, of solitude, his melancholy and emotion, and principally his aesthetic religion which appealed strongly to Lamartine. And it is in this latter influence, those religious ideas in the principal works of this poet, that we are interested. To understand more completely his religious philosophy, a few pertinent notes about his life are necessary.

Forced by the reign of terror of 1790 to abandon their home in Mâcon, France, the Lamartines were exiled to a little, unpretentious village of Milly, just fifteen kilometers away. Here the poet and his parents were kept prisoners in a small, dingy house which to Alphonse looked as "characterless as the village itself and just as lugubrious" inasmuch as it nestled within the towering structure and dark shadows of the large village church. His youth

was spent here largely under feminine and pious influence. His parents, we find, were attentive to his comforts in spite of their handicapped circumstances. It was his mother, he tells us, who taught him to read from a beautiful family Bible, which had been handed down from generations past as an heirloom. The daily Bible lesson and its influence on his life are explained in the following lines which are taken from his autobiography:

> This sacred book had pictures of religious subjects on every page. There were Sarah, Tobias and the angel, Joseph, Samuel, and all those beautiful patriarchal scenes. When I had recited my lesson perfectly, my mother uncovered the picture and holding the book open in her lap had me then look at it while she explained the picture as a reward for my having recited well. These daily explanations and commentaries from my mother inspired my youth. And as a result, I burned with a zeal to see those places in which those biblical scenes occurred; to visit the mountains which God had descended, to view those deserts in which the angels appeared in order to show Agar the hidden spring so that he might restore to life his poor child, who had been banished into the desert and was dying of thirst; to visit also those rivers which flowed into the earthly Paradise. This wish never was extinguished within me. I dreamed of these things always. I constructed in my thoughts a vast and religious epoch in which those beautiful places would be the principal scenes. Life for me was always a great poem; for my heart, it was love. God, love, and poetry are the three words which I should like to have engraved alone on my tombstone—if I ever merit such a stone.

It was this early reverence toward and belief in a Creator—an idea which was instilled in him by a devout mother—that inspired Lamartine's later religious works.

When he became older he was sent to a school conducted by a religious order to study the classics. His life here was seemingly pleasant and later he went on to college. Between the time he left college in 1807 and the publication of his first collection of poems, *Méditations,* in 1820, we find Lamartine very much occupied with the works of the English poet, Ossian, the Italian poet, Petrarch, Rousseau, Goethe, and Chateaubriand. Such readings, doubtless, enkindled his imagination with materials of the romantic movement, which French literature was about to enter.

It was on his trip to Italy that his poetical imagination became alive and his marked trait of sensibility awakened. At this time we find that he was writing a great deal of verse of different kinds, but it is the collection entitled *Poetical and Religious Harmonies* that especially attract attention.

The *Harmonies,* inspired by a religious fervor, are a group of lyrical poems which appeal to only a small number of meditative souls whose thoughts and minds, like this poet's, rise toward the ideas of the Infinite and who endeavor through outward signs and expressions to reach God. Lamartine, like all romanticists, attempts to capture the feeling of the moment, which in this poet's case was most often one of religious reverence for the Divine Power and the comfort He bestows upon humanity. God is felt again and again to be more visible in the ruins of the ancient temple, in the shadow of the Christian churches, and in the sufferings of the human soul. But it is primarily the scenes and awesome spectacle of nature which draws the poet closer to the Divinity. The most inspirational poems in the collection of the *Harmonies* are those lyrical hymns which Lamartine composed upon the promontories while intoxicated with the beauties of nature, under the expansive and free vault of the celestial firmament, and within sound of the sea and the winds. Note the following verses in which I give my own prose-like translation, inasmuch as the interest lies in the thought content only:

> Arise, voice within my soul!
> Rise up with the dawn, and with the night.
> Burst forth as the flame
> Spread out like a clamour.
> Float upon the wings of the clouds
> And mingle with the winds, with the storms
> With the thunder and the noise of the waves.

As we see by this stanza, love of nature pervades his work. Here the poet would unite his very soul with nature.

In another poem, "Morning Hymn," Lamartine reveals to us a God through the magnificence of things. We see this in the following lines:

Ascend, float on, roll along, fly, winds, flame,
Birds, waves, rays, vapors, perfumes, and voices.
Earth, exhale your breath! Man, raise up your soul!
Ascend, float on, and roll along, fulfill your laws.

Mount, fly to God, higher and still higher.
In the fires of the sun, his splendor you behold.
Bring back from the heavens, the spirit of the dawn.
Ascend again he is up there! descend and you behold
He is in everything.

And you, oh day, whose name began your course
Day which must render account to the God who created you.
Night to whom you have given birth now recalls you to
Your source
For you, too, must end in eternity.

The poet appears to be jealous of these great voices which mount higher and higher than his own and can better express the glory of God. Nevertheless he contents himself knowing that he carries within him a light, a soul, by which God is known, felt, and adored.

And in the poem "Hymn of a Child Upon Awakening," Lamartine reveals both versatility and complete understanding of child psychology. This poem was inspired by his little daughter, Julia, whose feelings toward the Supreme Being he has interpreted. These same lines, we are told, have been used as prayers by many people since their composition. Whereas in other poems of the *Harmonies* he shows God through the magnificence of things, this one perceives Him transparent through the clarity of a child's heart. In a naive and tender tone, Lamartine has succeeded very well in translating the ingenuousness of the child. Three very simple divisions can be found in this poem: the opening lines speak of the benefits that God has given us; then the following lines express the thanks of the child; and the concluding verses express the wishes of little Julia for herself and for others:

Oh, Father in Heaven, that my father adores
You whom one names only in kneeling
You whose name fearsome and kind
Makes my mother's head bend.

They say that this brilliant sun
Is only a plaything within your power·
And it swings beneath your feet
Like a silver-gilt lamp.

They say that it is you who created
The birds in the field;
And you, too, who gave to little children
A soul to know you.

They say that it is you who produces
The flowers which adorn the garden;
And that without you
The orchards would bear no fruit.

They say that you love to receive
The requests presented by children
Because of their innocence
That we unconsciously possess.

Then, oh, Lord, give water to the fountains.
Give the sparrows feathers
Give wool to the little lambs
And shade and dew to the plains.

Give health to the sick
Bread to the weeping beggar
A home to the orphan
And liberty to the prisoner.

Put into my soul justice
Place the truth upon my lips;
So that with teaching and devotion
Your word might grow into my heart.

Lamartine puts the religious thoughts of the *Harmonies*—and I have quoted only selections from a few of the sixty-five poems in the collection—in the form of sacred hymns, vibrant with the pious fervor that the poet states he often felt so deeply. They are optimistic, for the poet rejoices in contemplating God through the mysteries of nature because there he sees the evidence of the Infinite. He is joyful, too, for the privilege of singing his sacred praises, for the light of a faith which causes all atheism to vanish,

and finally for the feeling of personal dignity and worth which the awareness that we have a soul or a higher intellect gives us. In the sublime flight in which his soul soars toward the Divinity, he expresses a desire to see Him in all his attributes. He wonders, too, what name or better what names be more suggestive of his glories than the rather colorless word Infinite. But the fact that he does not succeed in knowing God ultimately never destroys his belief in a Supreme Being. In reality, this Being is an abstract creation, which comes out of the poet's numerous personal religious experiences. His God is neither revengeful nor a lawgiver, but is kind and beneficent. To tap God's mysterious resources one has only to become aware of the power within one's soul that can make a direct union with this Divine Power.

Lutheran World Missions

AT THE HALFWAY MARK IN THIS TWENTIETH CENTURY

Fredrik A. Schiotz

FORTY-TWO YEARS before Carey went to India and therewith ushered in the era of modern missions, Christian Fredrik Schwartz, the Danish Lutheran missionary, became a messenger to the gifted Tamil people in south India. From this early seed, mission interest has struck deep roots in Lutheran soil. Today there are probably two score of Lutheran or Lutheran orientated societies in Europe sponsoring work in almost every area charted on modern maps. Lutheran churches in North America have lived in the same stream of interest. World missions evokes more generous giving than any other single project in our benevolence programs.

This lively interest in missions continues apace today. The Scandinavian countries report new levels of concern. It is safe to say that despite the fact that political and economic conditions have combined to prevent German youth from getting to mission fields, there are more German youth volunteering and studying to serve as missionaries than there were before the war.

As one looks out across the contemporary Lutheran missions scene, the key word in this last decade is the now familiar phrase *orphaned missions*. LWA news releases have given us the obvious sense of these words; namely, the mission fields that were cut off from their sponsoring churches or societies by the dislocations of World War II. But we are less familiar with the dynamic meaning which these words symbolize. What began as a simple emergency ministry on a world wide front has become a process in which we have found ourselves as a world-wide Lutheran Church. It is in this sense that we may use the phrase *orphaned missions* as a key word in contemporary Lutheran missions.

Let us first observe how this process of finding ourselves became a vital experience on the mission fields. Gifts to orphaned fields have been channeled through the National Lutheran Council, but the name of the Lutheran World Federation has often been associated with our gifts. These two names have become household words in the most far-flung corners of the world. I have sat in a mission home in Kunming, China, and heard a missionary tell the story of aid that came in the "nick of time" as an experience of Providence surpassing all their previous experiences—and during the telling, tears of gratitude rolled down his cheeks. A German missionary in South Africa expressed appreciation by saying "Your help has given us a sense of a living Christian community." One African elder upon seeing me commented that he would never forget that he had seen a Lutheran pastor from the United States with his own eyes. Obviously, his seeing an American Lutheran pastor had given substance to the names National Lutheran Council and Lutheran World Federation, for which so many had conceived such a deep affection. All over the world there has come alive a sense of international community in the Church of the Reformation.

This vital sense of community has stimulated the will for team play. The Church of Sweden Mission has assisted in carrying the load in personnel and money on one of the Bethel Society's fields in Tanganyika and on the Leipzig field in India. The Swedish Evangelical society is carrying a similar load on one of the Berlin Mission Society's fields in Tanganyika. The Finnish Mission Society is providing some personnel. Two Danish societies, and soon a Norwegian society, are providing some help in personnel and support. And in China one Norwegian society is providing personnel on the field of the Berlin Mission Society. Recently, when one Norwegian director had secured dollars from us for their new work in Japan in exchange for sterling which we use in sterling areas, he commented, "It is marvelous what can be done when we allow our talk about cooperation to become fact."

The cynic may see the sense of community which issues from gratitude over gifts as something passing, something that is made

of straw. But there are events on the fields that point to deeper roots. In India the present Federation of Evangelical Lutheran Churches is sensing the need to move in the direction of a united Lutheran Church in India. There will be exploratory discussions at the convention in January, 1950. In South Africa where the Lutheran Church numbers about 350,000 members when the fields of the six Lutheran mission societies are taken into account, more cooperation may be in the offing. At Oxford, England, last summer, the secretaries of the two large Berlin and Hermannsburg societies, who are to visit South Africa in 1950, agreed to conduct field consultations to investigate possibilities for pushing cooperation beyond the present limited stage. Secretaries of other societies have already declared a readiness to join in steps that may some day eventuate in one Lutheran church in South Africa.

Some, who have stood on the outside looking in, watching what is happening in the Lutheran family, have felt drawn to us. In China the young churches of the Basel and Rhenish Mission societies have decided that they feel more at home in the Lutheran family than anywhere else and have applied for membership in the Lutheran Church of China.

The large Batak Church in Sumatra (about 500,000 members), a daughter of the Rhenish Mission Society, has applied for membership in the Lutheran World Federation. There are critics who attribute this decision of the Bataks to alleged large gifts that American Lutherans have dumped in their lap. Even now as I am writing, a letter has arrived which suggests that the Bataks applied for membership in LWF because we promised to build a university for them. As a matter of fact, the help that has reached the Bataks from us during the last two years has been negligible. We have made no promises for the future. We have merely stated that their needs will be considered along with requests that come to us from all over the world and that any commitments that we may make will be for only one year at a time.

The Batak application was laid on the table when it came before the executive committee of the LWF last summer. January 20 there will be a meeting between Batak and LWF representa-

tives in Trichinopoly, South India, to give further consideration to the Batak application. If there should issue from this meeting a recommendation for favorable action on the application, I know that one of the real reasons will be because those who will be there will sense a real community of spirit. During the days that Bishop Sandegren of the Tamil Lutheran Church in India and I visited among the Bataks in November 1948, whenever the Ephorus (their term for president) introduced us to a congregation, he stressed that the Lutheran Church is a church of the Word.

In few areas has the sense of a world wide Lutheran community been so evident as in the property negotiations that have been conducted to rescue mission properties from reparation funds. What happens at the level where goods and property are involved is often more revealing of a state of mutual trust or a lack of it than experiences at any other level.

While the war was still on, Dr. T. P. Fricke, executive secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the American Lutheran Church, visited Australia and New Guinea on behalf of the Neuendettelsau Society and the National Lutheran Council. American, Australian, and German Lutherans joined hands to form an Australian corporation that took title to all New Guinea Mission properties. This helped to set the stage for a united Lutheran church in New Guinea, saved the property titles, and when the war was over, made the missions eligible for war damage indemnities from the Australian government.

In Tanganyika the government has taken the stand that it will not allow any German society to return as a society. This would be disheartening news for any mission organization. But it must be said to the credit of the Berlin, Bethel, and Leipzig societies that when this report was given them at Hermannsburg, Germany last summer, they accepted the report at face value. They trust us and the Scandinavian Lutherans to administer this work as faithful stewards in their behalf.

In Palestine there are properties of six German mission societies. All are being administered by the National Lutheran Council as a U.S.A. Committee of the Lutheran World Federation.

Last summer the six societies concerned gave our representative, Dr. Edwin Moll, full powers of attorney that he might have a free hand in the negotiations that remain to be completed. What the final issue of the Palestine property will be we cannot say. But pending that day, we walk as brothers in the faith finding our freedom in a God-given mutual confidence.

Before the Lutheran World Federation actually came into being at Lund, Sweden, in the summer of 1947, Dr. Daniel Nelson, then the Council's representative in China, had already begun to refer to our China office as the China Branch of the Lutheran World Federation. The conditions that made Orphaned Missions an urgent need required the organization of the Lutheran World Federation, and the fruits of administering a program of such help produced the confidence that made Lund a possibility rather than a dream.

The program committee for Lund assigned a generous amount of time to world missions. Commission II devoted much of its attention to this phase of the church's work. Its report reflects a lively sense of responsibility: "The Church as the body of believers must live and proclaim the Gospel abroad, else it will incur the condemnation of the Lord and atrophy and perish." This responsibility was interpreted as a call for global solidarity, cooperation at every possible level, and a recognition of the interdependence of the younger and older churches.

It is remarkable how quickly the pronouncements of such a convention trickle through to remote places in the world. In India it has awakened thoughts that challenge the church to consider denationalizing its missions. Such action would have far reaching ramifications in personnel and finance. There would be many difficulties. But perhaps God calls us to find our new frontiers in facing just such problems.

Less than two years after Lund, Dr. Michelfelder, executive secretary of the Lutheran World Federation, proceeded to activate the Federation's first Commission, a Commission on World Missions. This Commission held its first meeting in connection with the meetings of the executive committee of the Lutheran World

Federation at Oxford, England, last summer. In the Commission's sessions one sensed a keen awareness that there are many problems that require our united attention. But the Commission did not hesitate or falter before this recognition. It accepted the war experiences as a tutor that God had given that we might come of age, clasp hands, and work together in facing the problems that beset world missions in this generation.

The mood and purposefulness that ruled in the Oxford sessions was sharply revealed in the enthusiasm with which a subcommittee reported on the world missions program for the 1952 Lutheran World Assembly. Its report calls for one day of plenary sessions devoted to world missions. On that day the program will center on the following four topics:

1) Report on Lutheran World Missions
2) Lutheran Theology and World Missions
3) Lutheran Ethics and Missionary Practice
4) Christianity and Culture

The report also asks that one of the Assembly commissions shall give its attention to world missions. Six subjects are assigned for research and study during 1950-51-52. Findings will then be submitted for discussion in the Assembly Commission meetings. The six topics for study are:

1) The Lutheran conception of church and church autonomy.
2) The partnership between the younger churches and the agencies of the sending churches.
3) The training for the ministry in the Lutheran Church.
4) The promotion of Lutheran literature and periodicals of the younger churches.
5) Lay responsibility and activity in the church.
6) The Lutheran Church in Communist areas.

The next LWF Assembly may well give world missions in the Lutheran Church a sense of direction for the next decade.

Notes and Studies

EXEGESIS OF EPHESIANS 2:1-7

R. H. Riensche

After the salutation of this epistle, Paul penned a doxology to God for having elected Christians already in eternity, having given them part in the redemption in Jesus here in time, and having granted them the assurance of the inheritance in store for them in the life to come (1:3-14). In the following passage he told the readers that he prayed unceasingly that God would let them know the exceeding greatness of His power toward us who believe. It is the same power by which He raised Jesus from the dead and exalted Him above all others (1:15-23).

Now he begins a new sentence with the words, "And you who were dead in trespasses and your sins." It seems rather puzzling that the sentence begins with the accusative, ὑμᾶς, for there seems to be no verb which controls the ὑμᾶς. True, the reader who has just heard of the fact that God made Jesus alive should be in the train of thought to understand καὶ ὑμᾶς as "also you." Thus he would find it implied that what God did for Jesus, He did also for the Christian readers of the epistle. This is the sense in which I understand the King James as well as the new Revised Standard Version. The question is, Is it correct to do this? Must the verb be supplied from the thought of the context? Is there no verb in the text which according to grammatical structure required Paul to write καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας?

We need only read the text to find a similar construction in verse 5: καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν. What does Paul mean? Just read on and you see that he states with three separate finite verbs what it is that God has done for us Christians who were dead in misdeeds: He made us alive together with Christ, and raised us up with Him, and set us in the heavenly realm with Christ Jesus.

It appears to me that Paul is saying: What God did for Jesus by His mighty power, He did also for you Christian readers who were dead in sins, and He did for us Christians elsewhere. That would make the main clause of this sentence, ὲ Θεὸς συνεζωοποίησεν καί συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν καὶ ὑμᾶς καὶ ἡμᾶς. In fact I see no other way in which to reconstruct the grammatical line of thought. And this makes perfectly good sense. It gives backbone not only to the sentence structure, but also to the logical thought. Around this mother-clause is grouped a characteristically Pauline brood of relative clauses, with complicated sets of modifiers (in one case a veritable chain of genitives), and a purpose-clause.

Once the structure is understood, the main difficulties are gone. However, there are some individual details which need clarification.

Note that in verse 1 and verse 5, the Apostle uses the present participle ὄντας in connection with finite aorist forms. What does that indicate? You who are dead, we who are dead? The simple fact is, of course, that, εἰμί has no imperfect or aorist participle. If Paul had wanted to express being dead in the past, he could have written the finite past form ἦτε. Would the fact that he did not choose this way, indicate that he meant to say their deadness was still present when he wrote this epistle? No, that can hardly be, for he goes on in verse 5 with the declaration, συνεζωοποίησεν—God made alive. Perhaps it was therefore not the time element at all that caused him to make use of the present participle, but rather that other quality of the Greek present tense which expresses linear or durative action or being. Both the present indicative and present participle carry this idea. Then the meaning would be, in the connection where aorists are used otherwise, there was a continuing period of time when you were dead (v. 1), and that is true also of the rest of us Christians—we were dead through our sins, for a continuing period of time (v. 5). For other examples of the use of the present participle with finite verbs of preterit meaning, see Luke 15:25, Matthew 19:22. Also observe verse 3, ποιοῦντες; and verse 4, ὤν·

In verse 2 we find the difficult chain of genitives: τῆς ἐξουσίας

τοῦ ἀέρος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἐνεργοῦντος. ὁ ἄρχων is the ruler or prince, and doubtlessly means Satan. Some think that ἐξουσία means the same as powers, namely the forces of the kingdom of the devil. But Paul does not use the singular of this noun in this sense; when he means this he uses the plural ἐξουσίαι as in 6:12. There he speaks of the devil as dwelling in the realm above the earth, ἐπαυρανίοις, not in the air. However, ἐξουσία may be taken in the sense of sphere of authority, jurisdiction. Where is the jurisdiction of the devil, where is the realm where he exerts his power? Not in the air, the lower atmosphere. But ἀήρ may be taken in a figurative sense: the atmosphere of the spirit which now works in the children of unbelief. That seems to mean that the word, spirit, is in apposition to ruler, and then should be in the same case. Actually, however, we find a genitive, not an accusative. To conjecture a case-mistake might be in order if there were no possibility of explaining the genitive without resorting to this. But it can make perfectly good sense as it stands: The devil is the ruler or prince who has a jurisdiction, namely, the realm or "atmosphere" of the spirit. What spirit? The spirit that works in the children of disobedience. That is the human spirit. When the readers were still dead in sins, they did wander around in accord with the time of this present world, in line with the prince whose jurisdiction is in the realm of man's soul—and it is just this sinful human spirit which operates powerfully in those who refuse to be persuaded by the Word of God.

In verse 3 Paul declares that all of us Christians once went about among the unbelievers in a similar pattern of life and were individuals who by nature were subject to God's anger. φύσει is a dative similar to those in verse 1. Children of wrath cannot mean that they were begotten or conceived by anger, but that they are persons subject to God's anger because of their natural condition. True, this passage does not emphasize or even state inborn sin, for Paul speaks directly about trespasses and sins in which the readers walked (v. 2), and says of himself together with other Christians that they all went by the desires of their flesh and did the will of the flesh. Yet if the question is raised, How does it happen that things were so, we will have to answer that the φύσις had something

to do with it, for by nature we were subject to anger, Paul declares. Why? What better reason can you see than this, that it was because of the sinful φύσις, *the* σάρξ, that ἐπιθυμίαι, led to living in sinful deeds? And this whole condition in which they were before they became Christians was a state of death—ὄντας νεκρούς. Their bodies were still alive, but they were in a condition in which they were cut off from Him who is the Life. Why did Paul stress these things? Because he wanted to get his point across.

In verses 5, 6, and 7 he makes that point and makes it very sharp: God made us alive and raised us up and set us in heaven with Christ Jesus. We and our condition had nothing to do with it: God was rich in mercy, because He loved us with a godly love, ἀγάπη (v. 4). ἀγάπη is a love which is not rooted in finding something desirable in the one loved, as in the case of ἔρος or φιλία, but it is god-like in that it loves even the undeserving. Paul's word, "Husbands, love your wives as Christ loved the Church" (Ephesians 5), is an admonition that men should love not merely for the sake of romantic thrills or personal satisfaction, but love even when their wives are not specially lovable, love even to the sacrifice of their own lives. Since God is One who has ἀγάπη, and loves with much love, He did for us Christians what He had done for Jesus: He made alive, He raised, He set in heaven. He did it for us together with Jesus: hence the compound verbs in συν—. In fact He did it ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. When did all this take place? When else than when we became Christians, when we were baptized? In Romans 6:4 it is stated that through baptism we were made partakers of His death and His resurrection.

Paul does not mean to say that everything is already complete in the present—there is still something important ahead, toward which God is aiming. The purpose for which God did these things for us Christians is that in the ages to come He might be able to demonstrate the superabundant wealth of His grace, through kindness toward us, in Christ Jesus.

Now let me briefly summarize what this passage says: God made also you Gentile Christian readers alive. Previously you were dead through falling beside the God-intended paths; you were

cut off from God through your wrong-doings. Once you wandered around in sins, in line with the time of this world, and in agreement with the ruler, Satan, whose jurisdiction is in the realm of the human spirit. While it is not said that the devil lives in the air, it is true that he has ability to exercise power in the region of men's spirits. The spirit of sinful man works in those who are characterized by unbelief and disobedience (Greek: sons of disobedience). All of us Christians once went by the desires of our sinful flesh, and we did what our sinful nature and minds demanded. We were naturally children on whom God's wrath rested, just like the rest of the human race. However, God had a wealth of mercy because He loved us very much (Greek: loved us with much love), and when we were dead through our misdeeds, He made us alive through Christ—by grace you individual Christians are saved—and He raised us up with Christ and seated us with Christ Jesus in the regions of heaven, above the realm of this universe. God did it in order that in the coming ages He might show the exceeding riches of His undeserved saving love, through kindness over us, in Christ Jesus.

God's goodness and grace and power have worked in our lives so that we became His children: a situation which has no relation to our just deserts—we are saved by grace!

God be praised!

THE PROBLEM OF THE TWO CUPS

J. Knudsen

The Lutheran Church places great emphasis upon the sacraments as means of grace. We accept two sacraments and we believe they are sacraments, because we believe they were instituted by Christ. The evidence for this we find in the testimony of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul, but the most important reporting of the words of institution, as we use them in the communion ritual, is found in Luke and Paul (Luke 22:19-20 and I Corinthians 11:23-25). These two passages therefore assume great significance.

In the view of this it is disturbing to find that the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament, published 1946, an extremely valuable and much needed translation, omits a part of the words of institution in Luke (22:19b-20) from the text and relegates it to a footnote. Behind this omission lies a New Testament problem which is not only significant but which touches upon very important fundamentals of New Testament evaluation.

The problem is first of all a manuscript problem, and it is an unusual one. The overwhelming evidence is in favor of the traditional reading, and yet the editors of R. S. V. have chosen to follow the reading of a minority group of manuscripts. In this they follow the example of Westcott and Hort who omitted the words and stated: "These difficulties—leave no moral doubt that the words in question were absent from the original text of Lc. . . ."[1] And they choose this reading of the minority group of manuscripts despite the fact that they in other important cases do not choose the reading of the same group where the situation is almost identical.

The manuscripts which omit the one and a half verses are D, or the Bezae manuscript of Cambridge which is dated from the sixth century, and the Old Latin versions of the New Testament. This grouping of D and the Latin versions has been called the "Western Text," and it differs in many instances from the great and older Uncial manuscripts, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Vaticanus, which come to us from the fourth and fifth centuries. Attempts have been made to group these latter manuscripts in various ways, but this grouping, which incidentally does not receive as much support now as it did some years ago, does not interest us in this connection. In several instances the so-called "Western" group omits material found in the other manuscripts, and on the assumption that the material has been interpolated in the other manuscripts these instances have been called "non Western interpolations," although a more fitting name would be "Western non interpolations."

1 International Critical Commentary on Luke, p. 497.

If it were only for the evidence of the so-called "Western Text," the problem would not be important and would probably be dismissed. But in this instance there is an additional set of evidence which corroborates the "Western Text," at least to some extent. This is the testimony of the ancient Syriac versions which originate in the second century and which we have in the Sinai palimpsest manuscripts from the fourth and fifth centuries and in the manuscripts from the fifth century published by Cureton. These two manuscript groups, which are entirely independent of the western tradition, also vary from the traditional reading. They do not omit verses 19b and 20, but they place those verses in a varying order before verses 17 and 18. About them Kenyon says that they are "all apparently attempts to get rid of the double mention of the cup."[2]

In other words, the copyists or editors of manuscripts experienced difficulties with the story of the institution and various remedies were offered. The problem is reduced to this: Do we have the original reading in the traditional form and did the western and the Syriac traditions independently find a problem which they tried to remedy by alteration or omission? Or do we have the original reading in the western or in the Syriac forms and did editors or copyists of other manuscripts add something to it? The editors of R. S. V. have evidently chosen the latter explanation. But if this choice is upheld, a text which is important, especially for Lutherans, is partly eliminated.

When the editors of R. S. V. chose the variant reading as the preferred one, and in doing so deviated from a procedure followed by themselves in other instances, they recognized a difficulty of the text which apparently bothered the Syriac translators as early as the second century. It is *the problem of the two cups.*

According to Luke's story, Jesus, when he sat at table, took a cup, and when he had given thanks he said: "Take this and divide it among yourselves, for I tell you that from now on I shall not drink the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes." This

2 Sir Frederic Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1941), p. 250.

is the part of the story which Luke shares with Mark and Matthew. Then he proceeds to tell about the breaking of the bread and likewise after supper the cup, thus mentioning a second cup or repeating the mention of the cup. This is the story which he, almost verbatim, shares with Paul in I Corinthians, only omitting the words "Do this as often as ye drink it in remembrance of me."

The two cups have always called for explanation. The traditional one is that there were several cups belonging to the Passover meal and that Luke mentions two of them where the others mention only one. That this explanation is unsatisfactory is undoubtedly believed by the editorial committee of R. S. V. I agree with them in this respect and concede that a problem of sources is involved, but when they choose the easy way out of the dilemma and omit 19b and 20, following the "Western Text," I cannot agree with them. And I think that their procedure is all the more surprising, inasmuch as they do not follow the "Western Text" in other disputed instances.

It is my conviction that we should accept and maintain the traditional reading. The manuscript evidence does not warrant the omission. To the contrary, it is against the stronger manuscript reading that the committee of R. S. V. has omitted the disputed verses, and even though the Syriac versions offer an unusual problem, the fact is probably this, that they only reflect the same kind of uncertainty which beset the editorial committee of R. S. V. It seems more logical to suppose that something has been omitted in certain manuscripts in order to solve a difficulty than that something should have been added, thus creating a difficulty. The possibility, of course, must be admitted that editors or copyists of the manuscripts which bring us the traditional reading may have interpolated the disputed words from another source, such as I Corinthians. If they did this, it would seem queer that they did not make an exact copy. And if they should by some striking agreement or coincidence have interpolated the ritual of the church, this must have been done so early that it already appeared as a problem to the Syriac translators in the second century. This seems for obvious reasons far-fetched, and it seems necessary to concede

that verses 19b and 20 were found in the original manuscript as it was written by Luke.

Settling the manuscript problem in favor of the traditional reading still leaves us, however, with the problem of the two cups. And if we reject the explanation that there were several Passover cups and that Luke mentions two of them, we have the obligation of explaining why and how he includes the mention of both of them. Inasmuch as Luke was not an eyewitness to the event, we run up against a problem of sources, and it is undoubtedly here that the solution must be found. The easiest solution would be to say that Luke had personal information not found in a written source and let it go at that, but even this solution would leave some problems unanswered and it would be a too easy way out. We must therefore attack the problem on the level of written source material.

It seems apparent that Luke operated with two different sources. According to opinions long held, he thus involved himself in a duplication of the cups, and if we accept the traditional reading as the correct one, he was guilty of carelessness. But carelessness is not characteristic of the Evangelist who began his gospel by saying that he had traced the course of all things accurately from the first and that he would write "in order," so that Theophilus might have certainty. Luke must have known what he was doing, and that which looks like carelessness to us, because we, with an age-old blind spot, look only at the cups, may not appear so, when we look at the problem as a whole. I therefore propose that, rather than looking merely at the two cups, we consider the passages vv. 15-18 and vv. 19-20 as two different units, each with a different source and that we seek the motivation for using both.

The first passage (vv. 15-18) shares several features with the other Synoptists, especially with Matthew. Part of v. 18, where Jesus says that he shall not henceforth drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come, has exactly the same words as Matthew 26:29. Luke thus appears to be using for these verses a source common to all the Synoptists. He omits, however, the verses which form Matthew's and Mark's version of the words of institution and he adds the statement, probably from the same

source but omitted in Matthew and Mark, that Jesus had desired to eat the passover with the disciples before he suffered and that he should not eat it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.

Luke probably wants to use this source, because he wants to include the complete statement that Jesus should neither eat nor drink with the disciples until the kingdom has come. In other words, he wants to include the warning of the passion and the promise of the kingdom. But he omits from this item the mention of the new covenant, because he wants to use the words of institution from another source. The duplication of the cups thus offers no problem, for he is apparently concerned only with the mention of the saying about eating and drinking with the disciples before the passion and the coming of the kingdom. Then he goes on to tell, from the other source, the story of the institution. He repeats the mention of the cup, but it is another connection. We might even say that, rather than creating a duplication, Luke is deliberately avoiding one. He eliminates the words of institution from the first source, because he has another purpose with this source, and because he knows that he is going to include the words from a different source.

Where then did Luke get the second source, and why was he not content, as were Matthew and Mark, with the story of the institution from the first source? The answer seems to be that he wanted to use the liturgical form of the words of institution as it was used in the service of the Eucharist and as we know it from Paul's usage in I Corinthians 11:26-29. He might have copied them from I Corinthians but this seems unlikely, for Luke does not elsewhere show any knowledge of Paul's letters.[3] That the form is liturgical and that Luke as well as Paul took it from the liturgy of the Eucharist seems likely. How else could they use quite identical words when there was no direct connection between the two writings and when at least two decades intervened? Furthermore, we have the testimony of Justin Martyr from the middle of the second century, that the words of institution were used litur-

3 "The Acts nowhere betrays any knowledge of them (Paul's letters)." Edgar J. Goodspeed, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937), p. 195.

gically in the service of the Eucharist (Justin's Apology I, Ch. 66).

To justify the emphasis upon source-units in the above argument and to underscore their significance it seems pertinent at this point to give a survey of the present day status of the study of New Testament sources. In order to do so we shall take an historical approach.

Traditionally the emphasis was upon the evangelist. It was considered of greatest importance that he was an apostle or that he had apostolic sources. In other words, eyewitnesses were all-important. This emphasis is, of course, still significant and must not be forgotten, but to it have been added other considerations. The first one of these was the study of written sources, usually thought of as a large body of material or even as documents. It was demonstrated that Matthew and Luke relied upon Mark and that they had another large body of material in common. The evangelist was to some extent reduced to the position of an editor or compiler and his purpose was largely considered to be historical. This was the approach of the nineteenth century with its great advance in historical research, especially in regard to the relationship of Matthew and Luke to Mark.

The exclusive emphasis upon historical research and the attempts to find the historical Jesus were stopped short by Wrede and others in the beginning of the twentieth century when they demonstrated that the gospels were written from both historical and theological considerations. Resultantly, it became almost a fad to find the theological elements, especially with emphasis upon eschatology, and from theology the emphasis of New Testament scholarship then shifted to the religious, philosophical, and sociological elements of ancient times which had influenced Christianity. Much ground has been gained by this effort, and many of the results are still valid and appreciated.

After World War I the emphasis shifted back theologically to the unique character of the Christian revelation and to emphasis upon the testimony of this in the gospels. At the same time new ground was gained in research in regard to the sources of the gospels. Instead of emphasizing the large bodies of material it was

shown that prior to these and as the basis for these lay small units of sources. We might say that the emphasis shifted from the written sources to the oral sources which preceded them. It is now commonly accepted that our original sources are these separate units and that we must be careful in placing emphasis upon the gathering and editing of the material. In other words, history and chronology assumed less significance than previously. The weight lies upon the religious testimony of the gospel material, testimony which brings to us the revelation of God through Christ.

The source-units of the gospels, many people now agree, have come to us, because they were used and preserved for special purposes. These purposes included their use as a guide to Christian life, as teaching units, as apologies or arguments, as testimony, and as texts for worship. They were used for one or several of these practical purposes before they were gathered into groups, and the largest bodies of material, even the gospels themselves, must be understood and used with the fact in mind that behind them lie these small units. In regard to our present problems of the two cups, or the two units of material which Luke used, it will be readily seen how significant this approach is. We must study even the story of the last days of Jesus, as it is told in Luke, with this in mind that the first form of a source was the small unit.

Out of this emphasis upon the early source-units comes an understanding of startling significance. It has to do with the authority and reliability of Scripture. No longer are we compelled to rely on a miraculous memory on the part of the evangelists or their eyewitness informers. No longer do we have to operate with hypothetical bodies of material whose unknown authors or collectors preceded the evangelists. Now we have reached a stage where we can with a great feeling of assurance place the authority in the Christian Church itself. For who was it that formed, used, and safeguarded the sources for us? Who was it that gave them their character of testimony and through them bore the witness that we now have in our gospels? It was the Christian Church. It was the living, real, faith-borne fellowship, created by the Holy Spirit and functioning as the vehicle of God through the Word

and the sacraments. The Church gave us the gospel, and what greater assurance can we have as to its validity and significance than that?

Up to this point we have not mentioned the name given to the twentieth century movement which has brought us all this new insight. This is not to be understood as a lack of gratitude or a lack of recognition. We must be willing to concede merit to Form Criticism. But we have kept out the name while establishing a certain understanding, because the name Form Criticism has not only been connected with the above mentioned features but also with certain other conclusions which we must regard less favorably or even reject. In fact, the name Form Criticism itself has been derived from some of the features which are objectionable.

The advocates of Form Criticism tell us, for instance, that the source-units of the New Testament must be taken as sub-literary material shaped by a community just as legends and folk-stories have come to us in many other instances. We can therefore assume, they say, that the process of formation is similar to that of other folk literature and that we can study and classify them on this basis. Using principles and procedures established in the study of folk literature, we can then take the units apart, find various layers of development and tradition within them, and then proceed to determine which portions of the units are original and which are later creations.

This procedure cannot be totally condemned, for there are instances in which it is justified. But it cannot, in my opinion, be justified as a general procedure. The main argument against it, and it is an important one, is that the source-units cannot be taken as sub-literary productions of a primitive community. They rose out of a community, but this community was the community of Christians. Their purpose with the units was that of testimony and they used them with practical objectives of teaching, preaching, worship, etc., in mind. With the basic assumptions of form development thus rejected, the general assurance with which the "layers" are being peeled apart also is discredited. The basis for dissection

thus becomes precarious and great caution must be used when probing within the units.

Another conclusion by form critics, that the units do not reflect reality as much as they reflect the beliefs and convictions of the Christian community, must also be rejected. Certainly, the units reflect the faith of the Christians, but to assume that their faith was not based on reality, is taking something for granted which the Christian witness rejects.

The basic mistake of Form Criticism is, then, that it fails to consider that the Christian Church is a creation of the Holy Spirit. It fails to see that God himself created a community of believers and that the faith of the Church is a gift from God. When we believe that the Church was created on the day of Pentecost and that the Christians were united into a community of the faith which baptized, broke the bread, worshipped, preached, and taught, then we must not only reject the claim that the source-units grew out of a primitive community, but then we are in a position really to appreciate that the church community gathered and safeguarded the source-units which form the content of our gospels.

Much has been written in Lutheran circles of late about the Word of God as a living, creative word, and for this we should be grateful. But these studies must be followed up by a demonstration of *how* the living Word of God has come to us. Luther has a statement in the Smalcald articles which gives us a start on this task. He writes (Part III, Article IV) of the Gospel: "We will now return to the Gospel which not merely in one way gives us counsel and aid against sin; for God is superabundantly rich in his grace. First, through the spoken word by which the forgiveness of sins is preached in the whole world, which is the peculiar office of the Gospel. Secondly, through baptism. Thirdly, through the holy sacrament of the altar. Fourthly, through the power of the keys, and also through the mutual conversation and consolation of the brethren." To summarize this, the Gospel of salvation, the living Word of God, works through preaching, the sacraments, and the Church (office and fellowship).

Although it is perhaps inherent in the others, we should add

a fifth category, namely that the Gospel works through testimony or the Christian witness, the Word of God as testimony. This testimony has again created two means through which the Word of God acts today. The one is the Word as confession (I believe in God the Father; I believe in Jesus Christ, God's Son, our Lord; I believe in the Holy Spirit and His creations). The other is the Word of God as Scripture,—the living testimony, created with a living purpose, which brings us a living message today. The Scripture thus comes to us out of the testimony, the care, and the practical usage of the Church.

With the methods and significance of modern research, which has brought us the theory of the source-units, in mind, let us recapitulate the proposed solution of the problem of the two cups. The story can be told in this fashion.

When Luke came to the point where he was about to tell the story of the last supper, he had two sources before him. The one was the story which had been used by Mark and which was also used by Matthew. It contained an interesting item of which Mark had only related a part, namely that Jesus would not eat or drink again with them until he had suffered and the kingdom had come. Mark had only included the statement about not drinking from the vine and had omitted the part about Jesus eating with them before he suffered. Apparently Luke wanted to tell the whole story, and he therefore included the mention of eating the Passover while also mentioning the cup. But he did not want to tell the story of the institution of the communion from this source, so he omitted the part which made reference to the actual words of institution.

Immediately thereafter he told the story of the institution of the Lord's Supper and for this he used a source unit which was familiar to all, the liturgical story from the Eucharist. He did not tell his readers that this was what he did, for it was not necessary to tell them. They were all very familiar with it, and they recognized it for what it was. It was not until some time had passed, and perhaps in a situation where the New Testament was being translated into a language other than the Greek and where either Syrians or Latins, using their own language in the ritual, were

unfamiliar with the liturgical language in the Greek, that men started to ponder the problem of the two cups and began to make allowance for it when they copied New Testament manuscripts.

Only one problem remains. It is the question whether the fact that Luke's account of the words of institution (and Paul's) has come to us in a ritualized or liturgical form, makes it less authentic. There might be some who would question its authenticity, if they had to consider it to be liturgical. In my opinion the opposite is the case. The fact that the early Church has taken one of its most sacred stories, has fixed its text in an exact liturgical form, and has thus safeguarded it through the early decades of formative church life, is perhaps the best guarantee we can have that the words are authentic. As early as twenty-five years after the actual institution Paul quotes these words. Two or three decades later Luke repeats them. Both men rely on the authority of the Church.

THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH IN CALIFORNIA

George H. Muedeking

The American Lutheran Church traces its antecedents to pre-revolutionary immigration to America. Yet only in the period since World War I has its expansion in the Golden State suggested that California was also an important part of the United States. The line can be drawn even closer. Until the year of the beginning of World War II, there were only twenty churches of this Synod in California, all but two of which had been started since the onset of World War I. Yet within the next seven years, the total of parishes had increased to sixty-two.

This remarkable change of policy in the planting of churches has been due to three factors primarily. First of all, in 1940 a "Pattern of Progress" was initiated by which every subsidized home-mission congregation assumes entire self-support of its own work on a sliding scale of assistance from home-mission funds, an assistance which ceases within five years. This program has al-

lowed money allocated to the California District of the American Lutheran Church to be spent for the exploitation of new fields rather than being used to support indefinitely older parishes which most often in church history seem to be ready to fly by themselves only when forcibly pushed from the nest.

The second factor was the dynamic leadership during these years of the Mission Committee, whose work has been sparked by a succession of selfless secretaries and chairmen whose congregations cooperated in granting them much time from their pastoral duties to supervise and encourage the missionaries in developing their work.

The third factor has been the close rapproachment between the general church officials responsible for the allocation of home-mission funds and the District Mission Committee. This cooperation was secured in two ways: by a judicious use of California's art of publicity—brochures on the need and history of California church expansion sent to all American Lutheran Church pastors, plus two movies shown at General Church Conventions and throughout the Church on California work. This direction of publicity at the base of the church pyramid has enabled the higher officials to proceed toward the development of the Synod in this State with a minimum of the usual hue and cry wherever a financial pie is cut. The second reason for the interest of the directors of Home-mission work in California, has been that by its rigid adherence to the "Pattern of Progress," the California District has shown itself eager to justify the faith of those in positions of responsibility in the highest church offices who recommended exploitation of their new immigration-frontier of American life.

The American Lutheran Church is the most recent of the Lutheran Synods in America. It was formed August 11, 1930, at Toledo, Ohio, by the uniting of the Buffalo Synod, the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Iowa and Other States, and the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Ohio and Other States. The new church body in that same year joined with the Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod in North America, the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, the Lutheran Free Church, and the United

Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, to form the American Lutheran Conference, a cooperative church effort which continues the autonomy of each constituent Synod. The American Lutheran Church also belongs to the National Lutheran Council, the agency of Lutheran cooperation in war relief, student service, orphaned mission support, resettlement of displaced persons, service to military personnel, publicity and public relations, mission work among the Jews and Negroes, and as liaison between the government and the Lutheran synods which belong to the Council. The Council represents more than two-thirds of America's Lutherans. The American Lutheran Church is also a charter member of the Lutheran World Federation, which is organized by countries, the American Section being the National Lutheran Council. The Synod is also a charter member of the World Council of Churches.

The oldest and largest of the three synods which merged into the American Lutheran Church, the Joint Synod of Ohio, originated at Somerset, Ohio, in 1818, when members of the Western Conference of the Pennsylvania Ministerium formed an autonomous group. Rev. J. Stach, the first Lutheran pastor in Ohio, and the Rev. Paul Henkel and some of his five ministerial sons were the responsible leaders in the formation of the Synod. Thus the American Lutheran Church casts its roots into the earliest American history, for the Pennsylvania Ministerium, the first organized Lutheran body in the colonies, came into existence under the guidance of Muhlenberg, in 1748. Out of this history comes also the continuing impetus of the American Lutheran Church to keep on the main road toward a unified Lutheran Church in our country.

The Buffalo Synod was organized in 1845, at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and was originally comprised of Lutherans led by Rev. J. A. A. Grabau, and Rev. H. von Rohr, who escaped persecution in Prussia by emigration. These pioneers had refused to accept the official Union-State-Church liturgical agenda, whose emasculated wording of the rite of the Lord's Supper deliberately masked the theological differences of the uniting Reformed and Lutheran congregations. While numerically small, and centered

largely around Buffalo, New York, and Milwaukee, the Synod, with its originating interest in strict confessional positions, played an interesting part in the development of the theology of Lutheranism in the United States. Out of this history comes the continuing effort of the American Lutheran Church to attain a united Lutheran organization in our country primarily on the basis of a unity of belief, rather than upon a simple unity of structure, polity, or Christian activities.

The Iowa Synod was formed in 1854, at St. Sebald, Iowa, directed toward its organization by the emissaries of Dr. J. K. W. Loehe, the leader of the practical mission-training Institute at Neuendettelsau, Germany. Loehe had interested himself not only in foreign missions, but in gathering the Lutherans migrating to America into congregations in their new homeland. He sent missionaries to Michigan and Iowa, particularly. This warm-hearted man has left an indelible stamp on Lutheranism in the United States, for he and his pastors worked closely with both the General Council, one of the predecessors of the present United Lutheran Church in America, and with the leaders of the Missouri Synod. Out of this history has come to the American Lutheran Church a lively interest in foreign mission work (New Guinea and the Madras Presidency, India), and a warm devotional piety in its congregational life.

Preliminary efforts to shepherd immigrant Lutherans to the Golden State were made as far back as 1892. Then Rev. F. W. Seeger, living in retirement in Monrovia, gathered a small group of Lutherans about him in that city and in Pasadena. The latter prospered sufficiently so that a house of worship could be dedicated, and forty-five adult members were reported to the Washington District of the Joint Synod of Ohio, by 1896. Pastor Seeger wired for a man from the Mission Board at Columbus, Ohio, to take over this work, but when the all too-frequent answer came back, "We have no men or money," the work was abandoned to the Missouri Synod, which now possesses therein a large congregation.

At Anaheim, Rev. Seeger served another group of Lutherans from Canada, but this work also came to nought. He began

a second congregation in Pasadena, which also disbanded after a few years.

In 1911, Rev. F. H. Basel organized a congregation at Santa Ana, St. Peter, which continues today as the mother church of the American Lutheran Church in the state. Rev. A. C. Kleinlein entered upon this work in 1912, and while preaching also at Laws-Bishop, El Centro, Holtville, Anaheim, and Pasadena, in 1913 organized Mt. Calvary Church in Los Angeles. In 1914 the church at Santa Ana was dedicated, the first building of the Synod in California.

Dr. C. E. Linder followed as the pastor at St. Peter, and he began the mission at Pomona, and built Grace Lutheran in Anaheim. Another pioneer in the work was the Rev. John Peters, who worked originally in Laws-Bishop, and has been responsible for the development of Messiah Church in Los Angeles.

Many of the presently strongest congregations of the Synod in California owe their existence to the employment of a field missionary, Rev. W. Lange, who is founder and present pastor of First Lutheran Church, Compton, and who did the initial work for St. Paul Church in Long Beach, First of Inglewood, First of Torrance, and Good Shepherd, San Diego. This work was all done between 1921 and 1928. Another pioneer worker, now pastor of St. Luke's, Sacramento, is the Rev. Arnold C. Schultz, who reorganized First English Lutheran in Pomona, and who began First Lutheran, Ontario.

The work of the former Iowa Synod was directed at the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys, where Sacramento, Elk Grove, Tulare, Rio Linda, and Lodi were selected as centers for work that has matured into flourishing congregations. The Lodi church has the largest membership of any congregation in the California District, approximately 1,000 members.

By 1930, the year of the formation of the American Lutheran Church, nineteen congregations, with sixteen active pastors, comprised the work. Three of these were self-supporting, requiring no subsidy from the general church body. While the work was heroically done with the means at hand, the total impact was limited by

the initial efforts to serve only the Lutheran immigrants. This may be illustrated most graphically by quoting the report to the Mission Board made by F. H. Besel, in beginning the Santa Ana work: "Someone told me quite a number of Germans were living in Santa Ana. I went there at once, but no one could direct me to any. I was nearly ready to give up and return home when I passed a large undertaking establishment. The comic idea struck me that in there I might get some information. I stepped in and asked, 'Did you ever bury any Lutherans?' Answer, 'Yes, I did.' I asked, 'Did you leave any alive?' The man answered with a hearty laugh: 'Yes, I think there are quite a few living in this town. Go to the next corner and inquire at the house back of the church.' Lutherans were found." It need scarcely be pointed out that Christian work, confined to Lutherans, and restricted to German Lutherans at that, would offer none of the virile expansion that a wider perspective would have granted.

The depression halted further expansion, which was not resumed until 1939 with the organization of Christ Lutheran in Monterey Park. With its success, other churches were begun in Westwood and Fullerton the following year. When in 1941 churches in Long Beach, Burbank, and Bellflower were started, the mission program snowballed. All these congregations assumed the newly created "Pattern of Progress" and became the pattern for progress for the mushrooming growth in the last eight years. This rapid growth continued through 1948, when it spilled over into the virgin territory of Arizona, where four churches were begun.

The Long Beach congregation, Holy Trinity, was the first instance of work where a pastor was called without benefit of any known number of Lutherans who would be interested in a congregation's formation. He was called to "so many city blocks" (anticipated housing development near the Douglas Aircraft plant), and the success of this work encouraged the Mission Committee to enter other such areas, including San Francisco, where two congregations were started in new housing areas in the next three years. It was this church which also made the first use of a full-

time "Parish Visitor," subsidized by the national Women's Missionary Federation of the Church. She, with other such workers subsequently employed, are used for half-year intervals in newer congregations to build up rapidly a strong constituency. It is the judgment of the writer, who was the founding pastor of Holy Trinity, that the use of the Parish Visitor more than equalled in effectiveness the employment of another full-time pastor.

The variety of work being done by the American Lutheran Church congregations in California has been enlarged by two efforts especially: the founding of the first inter-racial congregation near Compton a year ago, using a Parish Worker subsidized by the Board of Negro Missions, together with a white pastor; and the formation of four Christian Day Schools within the last four years. These schools, owned and supervised by individual congregations, received their guiding impetus from the Chapel of Peace congregation in Inglewood, which formed the first school, and which has guided a total of ten schools into being among the churches of the National Lutheran Council in the Los Angeles area. Rev. Edmund Krueger, the pastor of Chapel of Peace, has largely provided the leadership necessary for this development.

Other leaders in the development of California work, besides the missionary pastors mentioned, were these: The Rev. Wm. Hohberger, who came to Mt. Calvary from a professorship at Spokane College, in 1919. His scholarship exerted a constraining influence for the congregations amid the exotic growth of religious ideas in California. He was the first President when the California District was organized in 1923. Others were Rev. C. H. S. Hunziker, Rev. G. H. Schuster, and Rev. R. F. Kibler, all past presidents of the District, and all still active in California pastorates. Rev. Kibler was the president when the stupendous expansion under the "Pattern of Progress" was initiated, and his wise and cautious leadership can be given major credit for the responsiveness of the congregations to this new yardstick for maturity. Rev. R. D. Lechleitner, who organized Good Shepherd Church in Highland Park, and who has been elevated to the Executive Secretaryship of the Board of American Missions for the entire Church, con-

tinues his dynamic leadership in the life of the California congregations. It was while he was Secretary of the District Mission Committee that the "Pattern of Progress" was conceived and instituted. The first full-time salaried President of the District, the Rev. Konrad Koosman, was elected in 1946. Under his direction the American Lutheran Church has taken its place as a mature and recognized member of the churches of the Golden State.

Growth Tables:

Year	1890	1906	1916	1926	1936	1940	1946	1948
Congregations	2	none	2	15	19	22	47	55
Members	76	none	181	1390	1990	4325	7301	9308

NATIONAL CHURCHES FREE FROM ROME[1]

"Stalin would like to deliver the Russian Orthodoxy into the hands of the Church of Rome and then recognize the Pope as 'primus inter pares' in the spiritual field. . . ." This rather startling assertion is attributed to a comment of Roosevelt in 1944, who believed himself thus on the track of the secret plans of the Kremlin. It was the period of beautiful delusions, the springtime of American-Russian friendship, when the President of the United States was wont to prophesy the incorporation of Bolshevism into the scheme of things of the western world—a result of the inevitable process of "democratization" and of the inner purification of the communistic regime. The half decade which has passed since then has rudely destroyed these lovely "pictures in the clouds"—so also the relationship between Moscow and Rome. Let him be anathema—let him be damned whoever has friendly relations with godless communism! The ban which the Vatican hurled July 1, 1949, against the foe of the Kremlin is one of the high points of the intensified struggle of our time between the East and the West.

Whoever expected immediate sensational effects from this edict of excommunication has certainly been deceived. The Vati-

1 This article appeared in *Christ und Welt* (Stuttgart) Sept. 29, 1949 and is reproduced here in translation because of its interest as a view of developments in Eastern Europe from an observation point close to the "Iron Curtain."—Ed.

can thinks in terms of longer periods of time than does diplomacy, and this struggle—perhaps the greatest which the Catholic Church has endured in its almost two thousand years of history is seen in long perspective. Experience teaches that the mills of the Vatican grind slowly. The decree went first to the bishops, and then to the parishes, to the hundreds of thousands of priests and men belonging to the orders, to whom its enforcement was entrusted. As yet, the question of interpretation has only been partially answered.

No matter how heavy the papal ban may weigh in its fundamental nature, still it would be an error to dramatize its practical application. This will be different in each country, according to the variation foreseen in the decree between the voluntary and the compulsory support of communism on the part of the adherents of the Catholic Church. Freedom of decision is presupposed in the countries of the West. The Western Catholics will be more strictly held to account than the victims of "forced membership" so prevalent among large groups of the population in states under communistic regime. And still the real and decisive battle will take place there, behind the Iron Curtain. The papal decree, that communism and Catholicism exclude each other, cannot be recalled. The methods, however, by which it will be enforced, may be remarkably flexible. It was never the custom of the Vatican to close doors and possible channels of influence hastily.

This is true of the whole relationship between the Kremlin and the Vatican. The Vatican City hoped for a long, long time for a "modus vivendi." A year ago, when the former Secretary of State, Marshall, had a long interview with the pope during his visit in Rome, he acknowledged, after the conversation, that he didn't understand the Vatican. At that time the author of "Osservatore Romano," Count della Torre, in a series of articles had recommended a sort of "churchly" neutrality with regard to the crisis between the East and West. The relationship between Washington and Moscow has in the meanwhile become slightly less strained. It was, therefore, in contrast to the political development that the Pope delivered his anathema. It was also in contradiction to the tradition of the Vatican for it to tie itself to any certain

world power and thereby to forfeit its own freedom of decision. The commentaries of the Soviet press about "the final subjugation of the Vatican by the war-minded American monopoly capitalists" —these are brutal propaganda clichés.

As said: Catholicism avoided for a long time the forcing of its believers to choose between the church and the communistic party. Due to the development of the struggle of the church in the East, the decision could no longer be evaded. Up to 1944 the struggle between Soviet communism and religion had been confined to Russia—in other words, to the sphere of the Orthodox Church where the Vatican had no influence. The break through of Bolshevism into the West, in the meanwhile, transferred this struggle far beyond the boundaries of the U.S.S.R. For the first time in its history Soviet communism found itself next to whole nations of different confessions. Beside Protestant minorities of considerable strength, about forty-seven million Catholics live in the lands of the Iron Curtain. Through this inevitable contact with the Soviet system a new situation confronted the politics of the Vatican. The collision of the two powers became all the more inevitable since communism demanded insistently the control also of the souls of the people. There was, thus, no possibility of a living side by side and of a religious domain that is free from the state.

The trial of the Croatian archbishop Stepinac in Yugoslavia (which was then still on friendly terms with the Soviet) was the beginning of a chain of events which had its climax in the Czechoslovakian struggle of the church. The "return" of the Greek Catholic west Ukrainians into the realm of power of the Russian Orthodoxy followed, during the past year, the annexation of the Greek Catholic Church of Rumania through the Bucharest orthodox patriarch Justinian who favored the Soviet party. The trial against the Primate was, if one recalls the manner in which the cardinal was "prepared" for the trial, a challenge of battle by Moscow to the Vatican in terms of unsurpassed severity.

The assumption that after Hungary, Poland would become the principal scene of the offensive proved to be premature. There communism opposed a country of determined Catholic people, and

it would still require some time before its religion could be "overrun." Instead, the attack concentrated on Czechoslovakian Catholicism. In this connection a new and alarming element appeared which probably moved Pius XII finally to proclaim the decree which had been prepared for some time. We refer to the founding of the so-called "Catholic Action," which claimed to represent Christianity in its true form through the fusion of Catholicism and communism. With that the religious war entered an entirely new phase. After open persecutions had proved to be useless, the attempt was made to sever the bonds that tied the Catholic church members to Rome, under the pretense still of acknowledging the laws of the Faith. Communism appealed to the lower ranks of clergy, hoping to drive a wedge between the Episcopate and the parish priests, and then as the next step between the clergy and the laity. An objective of this "free from Rome movement" is the creation of Catholic "national churches," which then singly would become easy booty for the communistic politics of liquidation. Disloyal priests, like the former Minister of Health Plohjar of Prague, were supposed to become the nuclei of the movement which, logically developed, might issue in a demand for an anti-Pope.

It was not accidental that Prague was made the scene of this experiment. Czechoslovakia, which had never extinguished its national resentment against Rome, appeared to Communism as a favorable place for the idea of a national church. Referring to the severing of relations of Henry VIII with Rome, the acting premier of Czechoslovakia, Fierlinger, in a recent interview with the *New York Times* remarked: "We shall have to do exactly what England did in the sixteenth century. We are in the process of solving under very dramatic circumstances a problem similar to that of the Middle Ages, as England had to do in the time of the Tudors. In the fifteenth century we attempted in the 'Huss Movement' to free our State from papal influence. The tradition of the 'Huss Movement' is still alive with us today. . . ." In these sentences there is the undisguised hope of a schism, a cleavage within the church, which later spreading beyond Prague is intended to be a model for the other satellite countries. The attempt is openly made to negoti-

ate long overdue agreements between the church and Czech govment with the "Catholic Action" as the representative of the Catholic people instead of with the recalcitrant bishops. It is evident that the attempt to cause a split has succeeded quite well. Hence, the papal decree did not come at all too early. The government of Prague obviously wishes to forestall its execution by declaring every priest who carries out the edict of excommunication as guilty of "high" treason and beyond that (as servant of a foreign power) a betrayer of his country. Similar pronouncements come also out of Poland.

The effect of the papal curse has its own peculiar aspect in western Europe. It had been expected that the bishops' conference at Fulda would indicate the consequences for German Catholicism. In a statement which was given the public this was not done. Evidently the recent decline of the number of communistic votes at the election for the "Bundestag" allowed the episcopate to draw the conclusion it would be unnecessary trouble to test the situation with regard to the west German communism. It is reported from the Soviet zone of Germany that hardly a Catholic person is active as leader in the S.E.D.

It is a different matter in the Catholic Romance countries of France and Italy. The not few Italian communists, who up to the present have carried around in their pockets the Red party membership cards next to the prayer book, will now have to throw away one or the other. The communistic party of Italy still numbered at the time of the issuing of the decree more than 2.2 million "enrolled." Since then there has been a decline of membership and Togliatti would like to start an "offensive" against "a clerical 'obscurantismus' threatening the national culture." At the same time, he hoped for an increasing tension between the "Catholic Action" and parties of the laity, which, to be sure, still are cooperating in the regime of Gasperi but are rising more and more publicly against the "high-handed" ambitions of the clergy. In France, the "Union of Progressive Christians" presents a notable union of preeminently intellectual "leftist" Catholics, who make no secret of their leaning toward "certain aspects of communistic social

teaching." And the memory of the "mutual path" with the communists during the time of resistance also plays no small role. Yet such keen minds as Francois Mauriac or Emmanuel Mounier, the editor of "Esprit" can sympathize with the Union. However desirable a disentangling between the "Union of Progressive Christians" and the Communist Party may be, it is not difficult to understand the concern within the Union when the socially static groups which control the French party system feel themselves strengthened in their self-complacency by a papal decree.

So a difficult question is posed. The ban of the Vatican can be used only too easily in the lands of the West as defense for selfish thinking and acting, and as a "soft pillow" for a social conscience which has been "shaken up" by this scare of communism. Not every one who praises the decree speaks with the interests of the papacy at heart. Merely outlawing atheistic Bolshevism does not for a moment relieve Catholicism of its social duties. On the contrary, right now it must admit that the social order which is worthy of mankind, and for which it is striving, is just as far removed from capitalism as from communism. From this point of view it would seem that the message of the Pope to the Catholic Diet in Bochum (Westphalia) with its four points for a social program offered a positive counterpart to the decree of excommunication. Thus the Catholic Church finds itself confronting tendencies similar to those within Protestantism in the field of the new social order.

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

The Cost of Discipleship. By Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Translated by R. H. Fuller, with a memoir of the author by G. Leibholz. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1949. $2.50.

Both the author and the contents of this book are remarkable. No one can read the life story of the author, written by G. Leibholz as an introduction to the book, without becoming convinced that here was a man who manifested the simplicity and courage of the early Christian martyrs. Dr. Bonhoeffer was born in Breslau in 1906, and was appointed a lecturer in Systematic Theology in the University of Berlin in 1930 at the age of 24. When Hitler came to power in 1933, Dr. Bonhoeffer abandoned his academic career and openly denounced National Socialism over the radio. After spending two years in England he returned to Germany in 1935, but was not permitted to preach or to enter Berlin. From that time on he became a leader in the Confessing Church and carried on his work in spite of the opposition of the authorities. Friends managed to get him out of Germany in 1939, but after the war began he insisted that he must return and take his part in the struggle of the church. With a fine sense of loyalty and devotion he declared: "I shall have no right to participate in the reconstruction of Christian life in Germany after the war if I do not share the trials of this time with my people." In 1943 he was arrested by the Gestapo and, after spending two years in various prisons and concentration camps, he was executed by direct order of Himmler, April 9, 1945. About the same time his brother and the husbands of his two sisters were put to death by the Nazis.

The Cost of Discipleship was first published in Germany in 1937 under the title *Nachfolge.* It is divided into three sections: Grace and Discipleship, the Sermon on the Mount, The Church of Jesus Christ and the Life of Discipleship.

In the first section Dr. Bonhoeffer expounds some of the fundamental ideas of the Christian faith which guided him in his life and led him ultimately to martyrdom. Discipleship meant to him literally and positively to follow Christ in implicit obedience to his word. Failure to take this discipleship seriously has brought the church into a reliance on what he aptly describes as "cheap grace." This is the preaching of forgiveness without repentance, of love without holiness, and grace without obedience. But "costly" grace is the treasure hidden in the field, the rule of Christ, "the gospel which must be *sought* again and again, the gift that must be *asked* for, the door at which man must *knock.*" Grace is never man's possession which he can have and hold in his own right. "It is costly because it costs a man his life, and it is grace because it gives a man the only true life."

This idea of costly grace is really the theme of the book. The Christian is called to discipleship and to living "in the newness of life." Grace cannot be had by compromising with the world or by accepting the secularization of the church. That is cheap grace. But neither does the Christian withdraw from the world. The author interprets Luther's return to the world from the cloister as "the worst blow the world has suffered since the days of early Christianity." Luther in the monastery could carry on the practice of his Chris-

---

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

tian life without interference from the world, but also without interfering with the world. When the Christian life is lived *in* the world, it becomes a judgment against the world. It is in this situation that grace becomes costly, for it involves an uncompromising opposition to the world in obedience to Christ.

The exposition of the Sermon on the Mount follows the general tenor of the first section. The emphasis is on the seriousness of the call to discipleship and on the distinctive nature of the Christian life in the world. "A community of Jesus which seeks to hide itself has ceased to follow him." While many expositions of the Sermon try to bring it down to the ordinary levels of life, Dr. Bonhoeffer insists that Jesus means exactly what he says and that he expects obedience from his followers.

The third section is very brief. Here he expounds baptism as the experience of dying with Christ, the church as the Body of Christ, and the distinctive character of the fellowship with Christ.

One does not feel free to criticize such a book as this. It sets forth the Gospel of grace and discipleship, and the author has sealed his utterances with his own martyrdom. Nevertheless, one cannot help but feel that the exposition of the Christian life is one-sided. The relationship between Jesus and the believer is almost entirely that of master and slave. There is not much emphasis on love. Christ calls for surrender, obedience, and *Nachfolge,* but the author makes it clear that surrender and obedience are also gifts of God. It is an uncompromising book which challenges the complacency and optimism of the church. It can be understood and appreciated only by those who have at some time stood at the frontier where the battle rages between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of this world.

This book ought to find its way into the library of every earnest Christian. It is devotional reading of the highest order.

E. H. Wahlstrom

The Theology of the Old Testament. By Otto J. Baab. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1949. 287 pages. $3.50.

Professor Baab, of Garrett Biblical Institute, has written one of the best Old Testament studies of the present decade. For mastery of Biblical content it rivals R. H. Pfeiffer's *Introduction.* For philosophical grasp it may be equated with W. F. Albright's *From the Stone Age to Christianity.* And best of all, it may be said to stand upon the shoulders of G. E. Wright's *The Challenge of Israel's Faith* in its fervent, positive, and practical qualities. In short, here is a first-rate book that should leave its mark on teachers and students of our generation.

A preliminary chapter on the study of Old Testament theology utilizes the essay Baab contributed to the recent Chicago symposium, *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow.* Thereafter two cycles of four chapters each cover the ground.

The admirable qualities of what seem to this reviewer the outstanding chapters may first be pointed out. Then some few points of criticism may be raised. But in general it should be observed that the author everywhere evinces a splendid control of Old Testament materials and a keen discernment of its spirit. Recent writers on the Old Testament have perhaps overdone the prominence of the prophetic books. Not so Baab. His full and satisfying use of the historical books is especially notable. The sources J, E, D, and P are here justified by their works. The prophets are appreciated, of course, but their spirit is rightly seen emerging in narrative books, particularly in the Deuteronomic historians. And the later issues of prophecy in wisdom writings, psalms, and apocalypses are duly represented. Noteworthy, too, is the author's sense of the theological significance of the Psalter. Through all of this a strictly historical method is employed. Thus the spirit of Israel's great teachers and thinkers has been caught.

The chapter on the meaning of God

vigorously sets him forth as living, personal, holy and spiritual: the Creator and only God. There are some slips here, however. The whole earth is not full of his *holiness* (so on p. 36 and also on pp. 107, 263) but of his *glory*. This latter fails of treatment anywhere in the book, as the outward envelope of God's unique and holy Person. And again, God's Canaanite rival, Baal, was not a plurality of beings: "numerous gods of fertility" (p. 50). The cosmic Baal never comes into focus in the book. But readers will find him clearly presented in J. M. Myers' "Elijah and the Yahweh-Baal Conflict" (THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY, Vol. XIX, especially p. 398) as long ago as October, 1946, on lines previously laid down not only by Albright, but also by Eissfeldt and Bauer. Once more, the Lord's victory over Baal is not to be credited to Hosea (p. 50 f.) but to Elijah at Carmel (see Myers, *op. cit.*). A later reference to this, on p. 77, is obscure. Is the "long historical struggle between the two opposing cultures" to be dated from *before* Elijah (c. 840), or from *between* the writing down of the Elijah saga (c. 800) and the times of the Deuteronomic editor of Kings (c. 550)?

Few treatments of sin in the Old Testament are as good as Baab's for insights and for religiously satisfying contribution. But a misstatement occurs on p. 99: the Festival of Unleavened Cakes there appears to have been held three times a year! Also, on p. 108, what is the evidence that Job 15:14 is a scribal gloss? On p. 110 a similar statement is at least supported by the omission of a verse in a single Greek textual witness.

In the fine chapter on salvation the term for redeemer should be *go'el* (the participle, not the verb form there cited). And, on a larger matter, why is not the covenant traced, with P and Paul, from Abraham rather than from Sinai (pp. 117 and 137)? Indeed, on the latter page the Patriarch does appear at the initiation of "covenant history." Elsewhere (especially p. 136) he is denied this place. This looks like a too rigorous determination to exclude New Testament points of view. But Paul only followed P, or, more accurately, the Pentateuch as it stands. And what of a whole series of references like Ps. 47:9, Isa. 29:22, Micah 7:20, Josh. 24:2, 3, II Kings 13:23, Isa. 51:2, and Ps. 105:6, 9, 42? According to these Hebrew writers, who extend from the Assyrian to the Persian ages, everything said of the covenant relation in the fine summary on p. 138 was true also for Abraham. Elsewhere Baab shows he is not holding back from the full persuasion of Christian truth, since it can readily be read between the lines of pages like 142, on revelation in the Bible, the conclusion of this present chapter, p. 155, and, with direct reference to the New Testament, finally, on p. 271. The author's failure, then, to credit the Abrahamic covenant in Biblical tradition mars an otherwise excellent treatment of the central theme of Old Testament Theology.

The chapter on the Kingdom of God will surely be recognized as the most original in the book. Writers of older manuals, like Knudson and Wheeler Robinson (*Religious Ideas*), have not so much as an index reference to this significant topic. Davidson has but two. But Baab has brought this favorite term of the Gospels back into the Old Testament where its groundwork is properly to be laid.

The chapter on the problem of evil makes especially good and well-rounded use of the Biblical sources. But the footnote allusion to Pfeiffer's views of S and Job as Edomite (on p. 240) is confused. Job is not said by Pfeiffer to be from the S source, nor is either S or Job said by Pfeiffer to be Jewish in origin, as Baab's note seems to say.

Lutheran readers will do well to ponder the final chapter of this book, on the validity of Old Testament theology. They may or may not sympathize with the author in his opposition to Barth and Neo-orthodoxy on the Biblical view of God's sovereignty (see p. 263). But they

cannot help but assent to what he says of the view of God set forth in the Old Testament which "takes a mediating position . . . in insisting upon both the absolute power of God as sovereign judge . . . and the redemptive love of God, whose word hurts and also heals the wounds of men" (*ibid.*). And in so doing they should be led by this Methodist scholar back to a true Lutheran appreciation of the Old Testament's worth for theology. It truly is, as Baab describes it, and gives ample evidence of having found it, "the theologically creative literature of the Bible" (see p. 269). As a textbook in seminaries, this volume may be expected to spur mightily the currently reviving discipline of Old Testament theology.

CHARLES M. COOPER

Trials of a Translator. By Ronald Knox. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1949. xi, 113 pages. $2.00.

The translator on trial is Monsignor Knox, and his translations are: *The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; The Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and Holy Days, with Commentary; The Psalms in Latin and English;* and *The Old Testament, Vol. I, Genesis through Esther.* (At present he is working on Vol. II, *Job to Maccabees;* all are published by Sheed & Ward.)

His trials are: The difficulty of getting people to see why a new translation of the Scriptures needs to be made; the problem of deciding between the literal and the literary method of translation, and of finding an idiom that will be neither slangy, nor two centuries out of date, nor hopelessly "dated" for Englishmen in 2150; the question whether, in translating a translation (the Vulgate), one may look back at the original documents (Greek for the New Testament, Hebrew and Septuagint for the Old Testament); the restrictions imposed by liturgical usage; the criticisms of those who prefer the old versions (Douay, A. V.), but seldom read more than snippets of the Bible at a single sitting; and the difficulty of reconciling the translator's own scholarly judgment with the requirements for the "Imprimatur."

His reply is: The thing needs to be done, is worth doing, even though it is "nine years hard"; and when you do it you must ask, not "How shall I make this foreigner talk English" but "What would an Englishman have said to express the same?" The seven essays which comprise the book are devoted to explaining this theory of translation and to replying to some of the more notable criticisms. The style is fascinating, seasoned with humor and occasional satirical thrusts. Light is thrown on the exegesis of many passages of both the Old Testament and the New Testament. Readers of this journal will be interested especially in what he has to say about translating *"justus."* These essays and the new version of the Bible with which they deal are a welcome and valuable help in getting the Bible read today. Roman Catholics and Protestants both need the encouragement of modern translations. Here is the challenge of Monsignor Knox.

"Where are the Catholic *readers* of the Bible? When did you last come across one of your friends with a Bible open in front of him? In old days, non-Catholics used to read the Bible as a devotional exercise, much as we said the rosary. That is all over; nobody of my age who assists at the public solution of a cross-word can understand modern hesitations about the identity of Bildad the Shuhite, or Tiglath-Pileser. We are in an odd situation. Nobody reads the Bible. Popes and Bishops are always telling us we ought to read the Bible, and when you produce a translation of the Bible, the only thing people complain about is your rendering of the diminutive snippets that are read out in Church on Sundays. 'Of course,' they add, 'the book is all right for *private reading*'—in a tone which implies that such a practice is both rare and unimportant."

Of course!

RAYMOND T. STAMM

Toward a Reborn Church. By Walter Marshall Horton. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949. 122 pages. $1.50.

Last year Bishop Dun inaugurated the William Henry Hoover Lectureship on Christian Unity, which is a foundation of the Disciples Divinity House at the University of Chicago. This year Professor Horton, of Oberlin, continued the series with lectures which form the substance of this volume.

The author has had a part in many of the events and projects which make up the history of the Ecumenical Movement, and speaks from experience, therefore, as he gives us here a detailed review of what has happened between Edinburgh, 1910, and Amsterdam, 1948. The request is often made for a concise story of the movement. This volume can be warmly recommended as giving just this. The first four chapters present the leaders, the conferences, the purposes, the organization, which are associated with the seven modern cities of this new chapter in church history: Edinburgh, Stockholm, Lausanne, Jerusalem, Oxford, Madras, Amsterdam. The final chapters are a "forecast" of what is to be hoped for, after Amsterdam.

The study is more, then, than a history. It is an interpretation and an appeal. Professor Horton compares the movement to the progress of Israel towards the Promised Land, and believes that the Lord is leading his people toward peace and righteousness. But the simile is not to be pressed, for the Old Testament Promised Land left much to be desired—even in the matter of unity. It is in fact difficult to foresee where the Ecumenical Movement will bring the churches. It is a venture of faith, and the discussion of a rebirth of the church is the contribution which the author makes to the subject. Simply to unite the churches as they are would mean something, but little compared to the regeneration of the whole church in which divisions would of themselves disappear.

Professor Horton traces this latter idea to the preparatory studies before Amsterdam. In fact it was an idea that Nathan Soderblom urged (cf. the final paragraphs in his *Christian Fellowship*). And it may be that it is the motive that all along has inspired men like Mott, Brent, Soderblom, Temple. A divided church can be reunited not by schemes of organization, though they have their place, but ultimately only the Creative Spirit of God can make a new fellowship before which the old differences fade. We are thankful for this book which reveals the direction in which the ecumenical spirit now seems to be leading.

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

The Reunion of the Church. By Lesslie Newbigin. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948. 192 pages. $3.00.

It was my privilege to serve on a committee with Bishop Newbigin at the Amsterdam Assembly of the World Council of Churches, and to be in the same study section on the witness and work of the church in the world. His grave earnestness, his genuine sincerity, his cool and clear-headed thinking, and his frank, unaffected speaking won my respect and admiration. He is a true theologian, a real churchman, a devoted Christian.

You can take him at his word throughout this book, which exhibits the traits I have cited above. He is not interested in arguments or speculations: he is in dead earnest as he grapples honestly and humbly with this compelling problem: the reunion of the church. For the most part his interpretation and use of Scripture win our ready assent, and we are won to share his conviction that disunity in the church is sin and the result of sin, interfering with the mission of the church and the fellowship of the church within itself and with its Lord.

He analyzes the problem, studies approaches of various groups to the problem of unity, critically but apologetically reviews the experiment in South India and its "Scheme of Union," and draws us with him into some penetrating in-

vestigation of theology and Scripture.

A Lutheran will enjoy and appreciate this book immensely; it is so Gospel-centered, interprets so well our own theology in its chapter on "Justification by Faith," and insists so persuasively on a truly evangelical spirit coupled with "sound doctrine"—sincerely lived.

Not all Lutherans will agree with the statement: "The attempt to find the basis of Christian unity in a completely articulated theological system is part of the essence of sectarianism" (p. 185). We might not so readily accept the third of three sub-heads: "The Unity of the Church is of its Essence. . . . The Unity of the Church is a Spiritual Unity. . . . The Unity of the Church is a Corporeal Unity" (p. 52). Yet we find every assertion grounded in clear and logical fashion upon the central truths of the Gospel and direct or indirect quotations of the Scripture—and with that procedure all Lutherans must concur!

Space does not permit the lifting out of numerous choice sentences, which should be read in their context to be most meaningful. Let me simply say that to read this book, even the chapters dealing with the Scheme of Union adopted in South India, is like a seminar in theology, stimulating, enlightening, strengthening, convincing. The Lutheran deeply concerned about unity will want to read this book for guidance; the Lutheran not deeply concerned about unity ought to read this book for his own spiritual welfare!

H. L. Yochum

Folkets Röst. By Ingmar Stoltz. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1949. 109 pages. S: Kr. 3:50.

This little book is a study of the attitudes of the Swedish people to the church and to Christianity in general. It is of particular interest to us because of the interest in Swedish theology which has developed in our country during the last few years. This research shows what the reaction of the rank and file of the Swedish people to the ministrations of the church and the theologians is at the present time. We have here an answer to the question as to how vitally the church is affecting the lives of the Swedish people. A theology which does not function vitally in the lives of people needs some revision.

The study was made by Svenska Diakonistyrelsen and the Swedish Gallup Institute. The Gallup poll technique has been subjected to a great deal of scepticism since the last presidential election in the United States and the method is subject to a certain percentage of error, but it must be recalled that the Gallup poll was only 4.9 per cent in error with respect to the outcome of the election. For the present purpose such a percentage of error would not be very significant and the results of the study verify the personal observations of a great many students. The questions were concerned with attitudes to Christianity in general, Bible reading, prayer, and religious instruction in the public schools. With respect to the church, questions were asked about attendance at services, listening to sermons on the radio, baptism, the Lord's Supper, the pastor as a *Seelsorger* and the desirability of maintaining the church as a state church.

The attitudes of rural people, in general, were much more positive than those of urban dwellers. However, even in the rural areas 41 per cent said that they had not attended a church service for half a year. In the cities the percentage of those who had not attended was as high as 68. Only 8 to 9 per cent of the urbanites said that they read the Bible regularly, while in the rural areas the percentage was 20. Of the rural people 18 per cent said that they had communed more than five times since confirmation, while in the cities the percentage was as low as 7. About 8 per cent of the population over 20 years of age belong to the free churches.

Religious instruction in the public schools is favored by 72 per cent. Many who do not attend the churches favor the

retention of religious instruction in the schools, and the reason that they give is that it has a moral value. About 6 per cent want more religious instruction for the children and 5 per cent want it abolished.

Belief in God is shared by 80 per cent of the Swedes. By way of comparison, the percentage in the U. S. A. is 95. Fifty per cent of the Swedes believe in life after death, while in the U. S. A. the percentage is 80. Fifty-six per cent of the men say that they never say an evening prayer. The women do so more often than the men. Eighty-four per cent teach their children to pray. The middle class is more religiously inclined than the other classes of society.

About 20 per cent said that they had attended a service during the two weeks before the poll. The percentage for the U. S. is 30.

Northern, eastern, and southern Sweden have the highest frequency of church attendance.

Some 70 per cent listen to services on the radio, but the majority state that the radio service is not a substitute for personal attendance in church. It is to be noted, however, that the eye appeal of the church service is only mentioned by 13 per cent. The liturgy does not have the appeal to the younger people that it does to the older. For 61 per cent the sermon was the most important element in the service. However, about two-thirds stated that the sermons did not answer the problems in which they were interested. People want the sermon to give direction to life and they do not feel that they get it. The problems of truth are a vital problem for many who feel that this element is ignored in the sermons. Can it be that the anti-intellectualism of much modern Swedish theology is to blame for this? I have long felt that Lundensian theology does not come to grips with this matter. Of the 88 per cent who have their children baptized, 51 per cent say that they do it because it is a tradition with the Swedes. Twenty-four per cent stated that their confirmation solved their concrete religious problems, 18 per cent received a partial answer, and 49 per cent received no answer to their problems. Eighty-three per cent say that they have never had a personal interview with a pastor. Seventy-seven per cent would remain in the state church even if they could leave it.

This study cannot be very encouraging for the Church of Sweden. The fruits of failing to come to grips with the problems of the truth of religion and the quietism of Swedish theology are probably bearing fruit in the attitudes revealed in this interesting study.

A. D. Mattson

The Theology of Martin Luther. By H. H. Kramm. London: James Clarke & Co., 1947. 152 pages. 10*s.* 6*d.*

The author of this book is one of the few Lutheran ministers resident in England, and his main purpose is to further the process of making Luther known in England. That process is well under way. It received its greatest impetus in recent years through the works of a Methodist, Dr. Philip Watson, who is a disciple of Anders Nygren, of Lund, and an active participant in the current Luther renaissance.

Dr. Kramm is minister of the German Lutheran Church of St. Mary in the Savoy, London, and of the Lutheran congregation at Oxford. He attained his degree at Oxford and dedicated this little volume to Principal Miklem of Mansfield College there.

Only three aspects of Luther's theology are treated with any degree of comprehensiveness. These are Luther's teaching on the church and the ministry, his teaching on the Bible, and his teaching on the relation between church and state. Dr. Kramm points out that these three topics will be of particular interest to the English-speaking world, and clear thinking about them will best serve the ecumenical movement of our day. But these main topics are preceded by a clarifying Intro-

duction, a chapter on Luther's doctrine of man, and one on his doctrine of salvation (including the person and work of Christ, the sacraments, and the relation of Law and Gospel).

For his preliminary chapters the author leans heavily on Koestlin, Elert, Holl, and Mackinnon. His major chapters are based on his own studies of Luther. The brevity of treatment is balanced by copious references to the Weimar edition of Luther's works and to specialized literature on Luther. The author's knowledge of American Lutheran theology seems to be limited almost entirely to the output of the Missouri Synod theologians.

The book is intended for readers who have little previous acquaintance with Luther and Lutheranism, and it is pointed directly at clergymen and laymen in the Church of England. This is evident from the many references to the episcopacy, to apostolic succession, to inter-communion, to the state church, and even the designation of Luther's Catechism as Longer and Shorter. The style is so clear that the author rightly expects to be charged with over-simplification. The book undertakes answers to many practical and concrete questions that are being asked today about Luther and his teaching, and it refutes a number of false charges that have been made against Luther in recent years.

In discussing Luther's views on the church and the ministry, Dr. Kramm puts Luther's teachings into their historical framework and applies them to the current ecclesiastical situation of our day. True apostolic succession is the work done by the apostles and in the doctrine of the apostles. In that general framework Luther could put up with the most varying forms of church constitution, ordination, and liturgical practice. The ministry is instituted by God and is the property of the congregation. It is valid when it administers the Gospel. To this reviewer it does not seem correct to emphasize the rights of the universal priesthood of believers and to say nothing about its responsibilities. Nor is it historically accurate to say that "what causes the splitting of the Church Visible into denominations is mainly difference of opinion how faith can be created" (p. 70).

The chapter on Luther and the Bible covers much familiar ground but in a new way. When it comes to Luther's idea of Biblical inspiration Dr. Kramm is for once indefinite and ambiguous. "Faced with the divergence of most conscientious Lutheran scholars on this point, . . . I will refrain from judgment" (p. 108). Anyone who knows the inner condition of Lutheranism in England at this time will understand the prudence implied in that attitude.

The last chapter, the one on church and state, is the most original and worthwhile part of the book. By direct references to Luther's own words and within the historical framework of sixteenth century Germany, Luther's attitude toward secular government, toward war, toward the Jews is made crystal clear, and all of his positions in these matters are traced to his religious convictions. He was not anti-Semitic but anti-Judaistic (opposed to the religion of the Jews). Modern Nazism and Fascism find absolutely no warrant for their positions in the teaching of Martin Luther.

This volume should help English readers with slight Lutheran background to solve the puzzle that is Martin Luther and to understand his significance for present-day political, cultural, and ecclesiastical problems.

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ

Grossie. By Elmer A. Kettner. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1949. 119 pages. $1.50.

This is the life story of Anna K. Maier, the mother of the well-known radio preacher of the Lutheran Hour, the late Dr. Walter A. Maier. It is one of the most fascinating biographies this reviewer has ever read.

Born in humble circumstances in a little Saxon village, educated in a Lutheran

day school, married to a rather shiftless but kind-hearted musician and organ-tuner, Anna became the mother of two outstanding clergymen of the Missouri Synod, the confidante of pastors, professors, and leaders of the church, the friend and benefactress of thousands—a shining example of the sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit in the life of a humble child of God. Richly endowed by nature with a keen intellect, a warm heart, a strong will, a fine sense of humor, a remarkably retentive memory, considerable artistic skill, and a robust constitution, she placed all her gifts and talents at the service of her beloved Saviour. Her spiritual life was deep and strong, nourished as it was by a vast store of Scripture verses and hymns memorized in her childhood and youth. She was a good amateur theologian, able to hold her own with professionals in almost any discussion, though she never could see through all the intricacies of predestination and agreed with her pastor "that Dr. Walther had not clarified certain points" of this doctrine. In her more advanced years, when her grandchildren began to arrive, she became universally known as "Grossie," an abbreviation of the German word *Grossmutter* (grandmother). Hence the title of the book.

The author, her pastor for ten years, obviously has a special talent for biographical writing. His style is vivid, concrete, often rising to heights of dramatic description. Having read the book, one feels as if one knew Grossie personally and had become one of her friends. An excellent book for the family reading table and the Sunday School library.

P. H. Buehring

Origen's Concept of Penance. By Ernest F. Latko. Quebec, Canada: University of Laval, 1949. 178 pages.

The title of this doctor's dissertation by a Roman Catholic priest indicates immediately that the reader may expect to be disappointed unless he is interested in Patristics purely for their own sake. Also, a son of the Reformation will be unable to feel the wholehearted admiration of Mr. Latko for Origen's "brilliant solution" of the problem of remitting the irremissible, for he will recall Luther's letter to Staupitz in 1518: "I ventured to think those men false teachers who ascribed so much to works of penitence that they left us scarcely anything of penitence itself except trivial satisfactions and laborious confession, because, forsooth, they had derived their idea from the Latin words *poenitentiam agere,* which indicate an action, rather than a change of heart, and are in no way an equivalent for the Greek *metanoia.*"

The first three theses of the 95 Theses should also be quoted: "1. Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, when he said *Poenitentiam agite,* willed that the whole life of believers should be repentance. 2. This word cannot be understood to mean sacramental penance, i.e., confession and satisfaction, which is administered by the priests. 3. Yet it means not inward repentance only; nay, there is no inward repentance which does not outwardly work divers mortifications of the flesh." These three theses are relevant as a criticism of this book, not because we would expect Origen, who lived from about A. D. 185 to 254, to write as a post-Reformation church father, nor because Origen himself has a low view of the depth of repentance involved in penance, but because Mr. Latko, writing in the twentieth century, almost invariably translates Origen's *poenitentiam as penance,* equating penance and repentance, apparently not realizing that this is already a reading back into Origen of later developments in the dogma of penance; and, further, even though Mr. Latko does distinguish between penance as sorrow from the heart and penance as ecclesiastical intervention, he seems quite unaware of the fact that his conception of penance, more informed by Aquinas and the Council of Trent than by Origen, is completely earthbound, quantitative rather than qualitative, rela-

tive rather than absolute. Also, the third thesis of Luther wards off any countercriticism of Roman Catholic theologians that Luther and his followers have only a subjective conception of the sinner's relationship to God.

It is to be expected, of course, that Mr. Latko's thinking is confined within the bounds of a theology of merit. That is hardly his fault, and his work could hardly have merited the imprimatur of the bishop of Quebec if he had not conformed to the traditional structure of Catholic thought. To any Protestant, however, the frequency of quotation from the Old rather than the New Testament and the use of such phrases as "*virtue* of penance," "without a will to *appease* God there can be no salvation," "punishment is always *in proportion* to the gravity of the sin," "first do penance . . . if one is to obtain forgiveness of sins," "he alone receives remission of sin in baptism . . . who has *ceased* sinning," "justification comes to the soul *as a result* of sincere and contrite repentance [penance]," "the early Church was conscious of a certain power . . . over the souls of its members"—all this leaves an offensive taste in the mouth. Separately considered, some of these phrases would not be so objectionable. Fitting into the framework of a theology of merit, they are objectionable.

A particularly objectionable passage to one who has Luther's distaste for the *meritum de congruo* and *meritum de condigno* type of preparation for the saving activity of Christ is the passage on page 84: "Every soul that is guilty of mortal sin is dead. Christ does not come to a soul which is lifeless. If a soul should regain life through the reconciliation that comes after the completion of the exomologesis (public confession or satisfaction), then Christ, who is life, comes to the living soul, because just as there can be no light with darkness, justice with iniquity, even so life cannot exist with death." Obviously here the church and not the Christ is credited with the saving activity in behalf of the soul that is actually decisive. Involved is the idea of the angry God. Thus, page 128: "In penance the sinner must expiate his crime and placate an angry God in submitting to the workings of satisfaction, which will be imposed by the hierarchy."

Whether Mr. Latko would also agree with Origen's doctrine of the universal restoration of spirits that makes it a foregone conclusion that Origen can set no limits to the efficacy of penance, is something we cannot tell from this book, but it is pointless to ask how much of the book is Origen and how much is Latko, for Latko has nothing but admiration for Origen and weaves in his own interpretation of Origen with blithe disregard of the centuries separating him from the Alexandrian.

JOHN KUETHE

Bearing Witness to the Truth. By Harold Cooke Phillips. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1949. 219 pages. $2.50.

These six chapters by the Cleveland Baptist minister are the Lyman Beecher (Yale) Lectures on Preaching. No doubt so much has been said in previous series of Yale Lectures, and said so well, that it becomes increasingly difficult for the current lecturer to find a new angle of approach. That may account for the fact that these are not lectures on preaching, except for one.

The first three are rather philosophical in tone: What is Truth? Truth as Moral Reality, and Ways of Knowing the Truth. The other three are more practical, relating the Truth to the sermon, the preacher, and the Lord. They are entitled: The Sermon and the Truth, The Preacher and the Truth, and Christ the Truth.

To the reviewer's mind Chapter IV, The Sermon and the Truth, is the best one. Too often Dr. Phillips tends to draw on his well-stocked filing system and quote wise and witty men, one after the other. This is entertaining and even enlightening to the reader, but it is not Dr. Phillips. In Chapter IV the author gives

us more of himself, and what he gives us is worth listening to.

Of Bible preaching, for example, he says: "In the long last the most significant preaching is Bible-centered. . . . How can we preach or teach the Christian religion if we ignore it? . . . Preach the Bible. Never be ashamed or apologetic to do so."

And on the art of ending a sermon, this (p. 136): "When we launch out upon our discourse we ought to have a certain port in mind. When we reach port let us find the nearest and most available pier, pull our ship alongside, stop the engines, tie her up, drop the gangplank, and let the passengers off. Let us not steam into port, head for a certain pier, and then, just as the passengers think they are about to land, back away from it, try another and then another, and sometimes still another! Perhaps the passengers have had a pleasant and profitable voyage, and this uncertainty and indecision of mussing around in the harbor looking for a place to dock might cause them to forget how pleasant the voyage has been and quite ruin the whole trip."

J. A. Dell

Psychology and Religion for Everyday Living. By Charles T. Holman. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949. 177 pages. $2.50.

"This book is intended to indicate how an understanding of ourselves and of the resources inherent in religious faith may assist us in achieving a full, rich, and liberated life. . . . It does discuss some of the problems which we all face day by day as we pursue the quest for life, and inquires what help psychology and religion can give us toward finding solutions for these problems and toward realizing life at its best." The writing is lucid, even humorously disarming. Underneath can be felt the sure hand of the knowledge of the author who has pioneered in the religious field for an understanding of the benefits of psychological techniques for the ministry while at the University of Chicago.

In fact, the book is too easy to read, for those who look to it for help in understanding themselves are too likely to accept its insights as prescriptions rather than as encouragements to achieve honest evaluations of their own personalities through deep appraisal. Either to know Dr. Holman or to have read his other writings, or both, is to expect a better product from his pen. The common problems of adjustment, such as emotional immaturity, worry, habit formation, moods, inferiority feelings, hate, fear, and rationalizations, are dealt with, but scarcely deeply enough to merit the debt to depth psychology which his writing presupposes.

The pastor or student of human relations will not be guilty of pauperizing his library if this book is omitted, unless he wants an illustration of the type of literature his people can read and which help to make his ministry less effective to them. For the book, having been read by the people he wishes to help, will probably contribute to illustrate the proverb that "a little learning is a dangerous thing." This popularization of depth psychology, of which half our novels and a good share of our cinema are now guilty—going to heaven on a psycho-analyst's couch, as one movie critic put it recently—is not going to help people understand themselves nearly so much as it will serve to build up self-deceptions even more difficult to remove. Any counselor can agree from his experience that the most difficult to help are those with a sophisticated smattering of psychological terms, who have used these half-truths to protect themselves from an honest appraisal of their own personality structures. So, also, the book cannot be recommended except as bibliotherapy (where it can serve a useful purpose) to those who are laymen in the art of self-deception which the soul has perfected for itself. If the pastor or student wants the same thing this book offers, he can get it more cogently and more deeply reasoned in Fosdick's *On*

Being a Real Person. That book is obscure enough so that the lay reader will not be able to use it as prescriptions for his own problems, and at the same time it will enable the pastor to appreciate his need for using the techniques and insights of psyche-disclosure that we have available to us today.

Outside of the last chapter, "Where Religion Goes Beyond Reason," the book is a misnomer, as far as a Christian is concerned. For the book is simply a good presentation of all that liberal religion has to offer—the anthropocentric manipulation of God for our own purposes of well-being. But as a Christian understands his faith, that is not religion, at least not his. That is simply an ethic of self-realization based on the premise that we have an unexploited area of personality development, the Schleiermacherian "feeling for the Absolute" which, if we exploit it, will yield another motivation toward the Good (read: toward fullest possible self-realization). Christianity rather seriously needs someone who will offer for us today an interpretation of personality that points out the difference between "body, soul, and spirit" that St. Paul insists on. It needs an interpretation of personality that strikes out not from William James, but from Kierkegaard with his conviction that there must be the introduction of an entirely new category of existence when we rise up from the aesthetic through the ethical to the religious level of personality development. It needs a presentation that will show us who would serve our people with the most valid techniques for understanding themselves, that faith in Jesus Christ is a disparate category from getting along better with your wife or overcoming your worries and fears. We learned this sort of insight painfully in Christian history in relation to the body, e.g., that a man can have appendicitis and still be just as good a Christian as the person who has been in health all his life (John 9); and we learned it more recently in regard to present-day psychotics that they are not necessarily devil-possessed because they have schizophrenia. We need someone who will disclose for us in our generation that soul-sickness and spiritual sickness are not the same, and in fact may have no more relationship to each other than that psycho-somatic complications are to be held in the perspective for a true Christian that such liabilities, under faith in Jesus Christ, are changeable into exhibits of "the grace that is sufficient for thee, for my strength is made perfect in your weakness."

This extended treatment of Holman's book is therefore made in the hope that some of us may be prevented from being overwhelmed by the flood of books that will be upon us in the future on this subject. We must be clear what liberal religion has to offer. It is most clearly expressed, probably, by Fosdick in the book referred to: "Morality is rooted in psychology; consistency of character is one aspect of a successfully organized personality; integrity is impossible without integration, . . . but integration does not necessarily issue in integrity." We should agree with all of this, and begin to use the insight that more ethical behavior is going to result if we help people to understand themselves and become integrated around centers of increasingly more altruistic levels. But when Christianity enters, that is, faith in God and in Jesus Christ as Saviour, we must know that we have entered upon a new plane of existence altogether. We are not simply dressing up the old corpse more presentably, we are really dealing with a new birth. Liberal religion cannot help us here, with or without psychological props, for it cannot believe that a unique action by God himself, directed from Person to person, has occurred when a man becomes a Christian.

Perhaps we shall guard ourselves best against being taken in if we begin to teach and believe that there are only two uses of the Law, to restrain and convict. If we refuse to continue the unbiblical error that the Law is also a Rule to show

us how we are going to be more pleasing to God, we shall the more easily perceive that progress from skunkhood to sainthood is not a continuum, but a complete break, dependent on the action of God upon us, and not upon a simple, more valid understanding of our potentialities and our psychological liabilities.

GEORGE H. MUEDEKING

In Whom We Live. 313 pages. *Teach Me Thy Paths.* 322 pages. *For This Cause.* 311 pages. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1949. $2.75 each volume.

Three volumes of sermons, three sermons for each Sunday of the Trinity Season, come from the Augsburg Publishing House. The project itself is significant and ought to make a valuable contribution to Lutheran preaching. There is generally no lack of emphasis upon the dramatic seasons of the Church Year. Advent, Lent, Easter — these receive abundant treatment. But the season when the Sundays are known only by numbers and the numbers stretch on and on, does not seem very inspiring. The consequence is that the church often lets down in its preaching at the very time when it ought to be at the height of its effectiveness. The work of the Holy Spirit is not presented as completely and effectively as it ought to be.

This lack the three volumes, aptly and imaginatively titled, seek to supply. Here are three Gospel sermons for each of these important Sundays. The sermons are Scriptural, sound in doctrine, and designed to appeal to the people who sit in the pews. Each sermon by a different author adds to the interest and widespread appeal of the series.

Two positive qualities at once impress the reader. These sermons honor the Scriptures. They are Lutheran, not in the sense of a slavish adherence to conventional forms, but in their devotion to the Word of God. There is no fragmentary presentation of the Word, no use of little texts as starter devices. Great portions of the Bible are made the basis of the preaching. These preachers are not out to expound their social, political, or moral theories. They are manifestly ministers and messengers of the "Word of the Lord."

And the sermons reflect an insight into the understanding of the people to whom they are addressed. They meet people where they are. These preachers seem to know that their business is to instruct the hearers, and not merely to impress them. There is a down to earth quality about these messages. One does not mean that their content is trivial or lacking in the sublime insights of the Christian religion. One means that these preachers have found a way of speaking of eternal things in a familiar tongue. The truth that comes from beyond "this bourne of time and place" is given its application to the life of the world that now is as well as of the world that is to come. The hearers of most of these sermons are not likely to leave the church wondering what the preaching is all about.

A mild word of criticism may be spoken of the interpretation. It is not uniformly good. While the sermons are based upon extended passages of Scripture, not all of them faithfully interpret that Scripture. Sometimes the central thought of the passage is missed. Several of the sermons use two or three pages dwelling on the importance of reading the Scriptures aright and lose the opportunity for clear, instructive interpretation, talking about it instead of actually doing it. Certain of the parables of Jesus call for more distinct and definite interpretation than is given here.

The publishers of these volumes are to be commended for assembling a collection of sermons vital in subject and treatment and representing a cross section of preaching in a worthy and distinguished section of the church.

HARRY F. BAUGHMAN

My Heart's Desire. By Maynard A. Force. Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1949. 152 pages. $1.75.

This volume has been written by a faculty member of the Lutheran Bible Institute of Minneapolis. It is thoroughly Biblical and brings to bear related Bible passages in a very telling way. However, the style is not so easy flowing or well-rounded as might be expected in a volume of this type. It should serve as an excellent guide for family devotions, providing stimulating, short, complete units which are not dependent on the previous chapter for complete appreciation. The exact location of practically all the Scriptural references is given.

There is very little that is new or unique in the volume, and to those readers who are accustomed to the Lutheran interpretation there will be nothing contrary to their beliefs. The author presents the miracles of Old and New Testament as fact but is quick to allegorize the application. The complete, inerrant inspiration of the Scriptures is assumed throughout.

The book could be used as a study guide for discussion groups of young adults. It is not the kind of volume that one would want to read through from cover to cover and attempt to obtain a completely correlated unit of material, but rather read a chapter each day as nourishment for spiritual growth.

R. D. Lechleitner

Lift Up Your Hearts! By Ruby Lornell. Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1949. 63 pages. 60 cents.

Das Tuch der Veronika. Werke des Holzbildhauers Otto Flath in 42 Bildern. Mit einer Einführung von Gerhard Kunze. Hamburg: Reich & Heidrich, Evangelischer Verlag, 1949. 48 Seiten.

These two little booklets will help any lover of beauty to appreciate more fully the use of art in religion. *Lift Up Your Hearts,* by Ruby Lornell, is beautifully illustrated with photographs by Marcus Lornell. It offers an introduction to the practical symbolism of the church building, to the meaning of vestments and paraments, to the order of the church year, and to the structure of the Lutheran liturgy. In dealing with the worship service, the author uses the form current in the Augustana Lutheran Church. However, practically all of her remarks in the rest of the book are so chastely and carefully put that the book will be welcomed by all earnest Lutherans who seek to understand more fully the function and meaning of the historic church building, the vestments of the clergy, and the service itself. In short, this booklet will help the layman to understand and appreciate the of art of Christian worship as practiced among Lutherans.

Das Tuch der Veronika (Lichtblick Kunstbücherei 1) shows us how a contemporary German artist, Otto Flath, uses the fine art of wood carving for religious purposes. There are some secular works shown among the 42 illustrations. But by far the most of them are carvings for churches, and several complete altar groups—tryptichs, panels, and single figures—are shown. The introduction gives us an insight into the work and ideals of the artist who dreams his dreams and then shapes them into visibility out of a block of wood. This little booklet will be of special interest to those who wish to see a sample of good contemporary wood carving intended to aid the devotion of the worshiping congregation.

Albert A. Jagnow

The Finances of a Church. By Robert Cashman. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949. 160 pages. $2.00.

Robert Cashman is a layman who understands the problems of ministers. He is an experienced teacher of Church Administration. Both laymen and ministers will find in this book the correct answers to such questions as: "What is the connection between proper care of church property and the spiritual program of a

congregation?" "How can the annual every member canvass be varied from year to year?" "What is the best role for women's associations in church finance?" "What are some substitutes for money raising 'stunts'?" "How should one prepare a budget?"

"Church finance is important because money represents life." The more than 200,000 churches in the United States spend half a billion dollars each year in carrying out their annual programs. It is important that the church should make the finest possible use of its funds. And at the same time the church needs to develop the spirit of stewardship. For the people of the United States spend "ten times as much for gambling, eight times as much for liquor, and six times as much for tobacco as they do for the work of the church." This book will help churchmen to fulfill their mission in securing and spending the Lord's money.

One of the valuable chapters of the book contains a very helpful list of questions to be used as a check list on the proper care of church property. Here, too, is found a clear statement of the duties of the finance committee and of officers handling monies.

HARVEY D. HOOVER

Vom hohen Ethos der Brautliebe. Die Brautbriefe A. H. Cremers. Edited by Wilhelm Koepp. Hamburg: Reich & Heidrich, 1948. 144 pages.

This volume represents the letters of Hermann Cremer, the philologist and theologian, written to his bride, Marie Huelsmann, during the period of their engagement, July 8 to October 8, 1862. The editor is the husband of one of Cremer's granddaughters.

The forty-odd letters are hardly to be regarded as models for those seeking help in this form of expression. In lines allegedly from Shakespeare the author commends his clumsiness in speaking the language of love:

"Es sind herzensgute Kerls,
Aber schlechte Musikanten."

To the outsider the over-abundant protestations of affection would weaken the author's case if his sincerity were not so apparent from his very helplessness.

Disregarding the moot question of whether or not it is ethical to publish a man's love letters, even though he is long dead, it cannot be denied that these letters cast a new light on the character of Hermann Cremer, who is sometimes regarded as a rather gloomy product of the somewhat austere type of theology that he represented. Besides being extremely valuable to the biographer and historian, they must be of interest to anyone who cares to follow the psychological readjustment of a scholar and recluse who suddenly finds even the privacy of his theological sanctum invaded by a new presence—the persistent, ecstatic thought of his beloved Marie.

The greater value of the book perhaps lies in the author's effort at integrating a deep and sincere love with an equally deep and sincere theology. The manner may seem distasteful to some because it sometimes tends toward the pietistic—but who has the right to set up standards in a matter so personal? At any rate Hermann and Marie seem to have come to a complete understanding of each other's inner life during their *Brautstand* and, judging by subsequent history, also during their married life. The family life in the Cremer home is said to have been a very happy and cheerful one. The book here touches upon a problem of married life that is often slighted or even scorned by our generation, as though husband and wife could live their love life and their religious life in hermetically sealed and separate compartments. The premarital counselor will find much sound and stimulating material in this love literature of almost a century ago.

EMIL W. MATZNER

Man's Restless Search. By Barbara Spofford Morgan. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949. 224 pages. $2.50.

Man's Restless Search is an inquiry looking toward the revival of the power of spirit in our age. The inquiry is conducted against a background which reveals the need of which man has been conscious at different times, which have influenced the kinds of answers to which he has attained during the course of his journey. What the author recognizes as the age of faith came as a result of the need for protection. Then a new requirement appeared, the need for freedom; and out of this came the age of reason. Today man is more conscious of his need to master the inner world, by reason of the personal dilemmas in which he finds himself involved; and it is the belief of the author that this most recent need will be the gateway to a new age, the age of spirit.

Against this background the book then goes on to describe the pursuit of spiritual life and power for men and women of the present day, along the avenues of thought, mysticism, and ethical aspiration. The discussion is cool yet deeply serious, more philosophical than theological. In the first part of the book a searching analysis is made of the inadequacy of materialism for man's happiness and well-being. Much is said about the church and religion, about God and the Bible, and about prevailing attitudes among people of today; these reflections will certainly prove suggestive, if they do not always gain assent of the reader. The observations on the "cult of optimism" (ch. 7) and on the account of the development of the idea of God in the Old Testament (pp. 94-95) might be mentioned as examples. This book should be of interest and value to people in the church, and more especially to clergymen who are not afraid of a rational argument. For the churchman, two inadequacies appear: the estimate of our Lord seems to fall just short of a sufficient one; and the concept of the *revelation* of God in Jesus Christ, and in the Bible, appears to be beyond the author's view.

GEORGE R. SELTZER

When the Lamp Flickers. By Leslie D. Weatherhead. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949. 206 pages. $2.50.

In this volume twenty-one perplexing questions raised by members of his congregation are answered in as many sermons by the renowned minister of City Temple, London. Taking his title from the Psalmist's expression, "Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet," Dr. Weatherhead seeks to turn the light which sometimes flickers in the minds of men into a clear and shining one.

The sermons have grown out of the experiences of a rich ministry of twelve years in the most famous "preaching post" in Great Britain. During this period the congregation under the trials of war was forced to seek a place of worship in seven different buildings. Under such circumstances his people faced many perplexing problems. Out of deep affection for them, their faithful pastor endeavors to answer their expressed needs.

Among the questions proposed and answered are: Did Jesus distinguish between sacred and secular? Did Jesus repudiate the Old Testament? Did Jesus disapprove of wealth? Can a Christian be a Communist? How should a Christian regard Sunday? Is every Christian a priest? Will Christ visibly return to earth? Is Christianity out of date?

In his effort to answer each of these questions in a sermonic manner Dr. Weatherhead has sought to express the meaning of Scripture and the mind of Christ for men of our day. An enemy of the superficial and perfunctory in religion, he expresses a faith that is genuine, practical, and satisfying.

Naturally, not all of the sermons are of equal value. Nor are all the answers given fully satisfying. Somewhat liberal in his views, the author at times breaks with

traditional interpretations. For example, he does not believe that Jesus cursed the fig tree, nor that we should expect his visible return. He is more concerned about the tempest in men's hearts than about the question: Did Jesus really still a storm?

Of particular interest is his treatment of the sacred and the secular. Long before him Luther emphasized the relation of religion to the whole life. Every common calling is sacred. Attempting to distinguish between what is sacred and what is secular often results in false formalism and worldliness. With fresh illustrations Dr. Weatherhead seeks to establish anew the principle that religion is life. Says he, "Some men would be more religious if they gave up office in the church and concentrated on the welfare of the people in the office they work in every day. . . . Do not let us talk or think or act as though religious talk and religious exercises were the whole of religion."

In his interpretation of Jesus' attitude toward the Old Testament Dr. Weatherhead apparently fails to recognize adequately the Gospel in the Hebrew Scriptures. He seems to feel that we should leave behind the atmosphere of the Old Testament now that we have the light of the New. At least he advises, "Don't live in the Old Testament. We don't belong to that old dispensation. Come out of its atmosphere without delay! There are, admittedly, patches of sunshine, but oh, so many shadows to frighten you. You are children of the day. Why cling to the shadows?" (p. 34). Rightly understood, however, the Old Testament is full of light.

One of the best sermons in the book is that setting forth the answer to the question: Can a Christian be a Communist? After expressing an admiration for Communism for its positive elements of universalism, concern for the needy, and the devotion and missionary zeal of its adherents, Dr. Weatherhead points out courageously and unequivocally its irreconcilability with Christianity. It leaves out God, employs methods of force, violence, and torture, destroys freedom of life, and regards the state as the highest end. Christianity, on the other hand, holds a healthy attitude toward the state, believes in one world, regards men as brethren, and seeks the salvation of both the individual and society. But it fails to measure up to its ideals. Hence the great need for Christian social action.

For both pulpit and pew this volume has value, for it stems out of life and touches life at several important points.

E. E. Flack

The Prophetic Faith. By Martin Buber New York: Macmillan. 1949. 247 pages. $3.75.

One of the foremost Hebrew scholars of Palestine has here made an important contribution to the study of the Old Testament. Martin Buber, who is more a philosopher and theologian than an Old Testament scholar, nevertheless knows his way around in the field. His critical orientation is somewhat middle-of-the-road. He emphasizes the reliability of the oral tradition behind many of the written records of the Old Testament. In the story of religious evolution he deliberately ignores the henotheist versus monotheist conflict. The interpretation of the name Jahve follows that of Montgomery on the basis of the pronoun "he." The one God was Baalized during the times of Amos and Hosea. This made the task of the prophets not one of innovation or condemnation of pagan deities, but of reformation and recall to the original concept of Jahve.

In the early Messianism of Isaiah, Buber does not see any relation to eschatology. The idea of the afterlife is considered very late largely because "it is not the immortality of the soul that is the concern of this belief, but the eternity of God" (202). The messiah in Deutero-Isaiah is admittedly a paradox, but Buber is forced to select the prophet himself as the most likely candidate. Buber protests against earlier attempts to date

and to parse prophecies of doom from those of salvation. The prophetic faith is one which demanded of the hearer a decision (p. 2).

This book is such that a decision also is awaited. There is a deepening religious insight in every advancing section, suggestive of some great climax which fails to come off. Unfulfilled, without Christ, the prophetic faith forms a bare truncated skeleton. Nevertheless, the Christian will reap great benefits from this Jewish contribution to the understanding of the prophetic faith.

C. Umhau Wolf

The Book of the Twelve Prophets, Volume Two. Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Haggai, Zechariah, Obadiah, Joel, and Jonah in the King James Version with Introduction and Critical Notes. By Julius A. Bewer. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949. 112 pages. 75 cents.

This is "the second issue in Harper's Annotated Bible Series" and it maintains the same high standard of excellence set in the first issue. As was pointed out by the reviewer of that issue (*Lutheran Quarterly*, Vol. 1, p. 341), the text printed is that of the King James version but the exalted poetry of the prophets is presented in appropriate form, while the prose sections are paragraphed rather than fragmentized in the usual form, though the traditional verses are noted.

There are three short chapters on the historical situation encountered by the prophets dealt with: The Prophets of the Seventh Century, The Prophets of the Persian Period, and The Prophets of the Greek Period. Each book has its own introduction—a model of condensation—and the footnotes explain quite adequately difficult passages or words.

Professor Bewer has done an altogether praiseworthy piece of work, just the thing for the interested Bible student, be he church school teacher, seminary student, or pastor. We shall eagerly await the succeeding volumes of this fine series.

J. M. Myers

Kirchenagende I, Band 1. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1949. 235 pages. DM 15.

This is the most complete and, perhaps, the most significant restoration and reconstruction of the Lutheran Liturgy (*Hauptgottesdienst*) which has appeared in Germany in many decades. In content and in form, it is a distinguished work. Its importance lies, not merely in its completeness, but in the principles which determined its preparation and in the scholarship which has mastered a complex body of liturgical and musical detail.

Basically this work is a faithful exposition of Reformation principles and forms of the conservative Lutheran type, with practically no concession to Reformed or mediating preferences. In addition, its ecumenical spirit steps courageously beyond provincial precedents, appropriates the finest fruits of modern liturgical research and incorporates a limited but important body of fresh material chiefly from the services of the early church. The net result is a new German Liturgy which in scope and detail is in close agreement with our English Common Service and which in several respects anticipates features of the proposed Common Liturgy for the member churches of the National Lutheran Council.

The volume under review is an altar edition for the use of ministers. It is 10 x 7 inches in size, with section headings, titles, rubrics, and musical staves printed in red. There are gold stampings in bold primitive design on the binding and line engravings of extremely modernistic character throughout the book. The latter reflect current European taste but would be quite unacceptable to our congregations in America. Complete musical settings provide intonations for the chanting by the minister of the Proper Prefaces, Words of Institution, Lord's Prayer, Benediction, and other parts of the service.

A second volume will contain texts and music for the congregation; a third will provide musical settings for organists and choirs; a fourth will be a scholarly commentary on the entire work.

The *Agende* is the result of eight years' study and cooperative endeavor by the Liturgical Commissions of the Confessing (*Bekennende*) Churches of the Rhineland and Westphalia, representatives of the Lutheran Liturgical Conference and of other liturgical associations in Germany. It had its origin in the decision of the Confessing Synod of the old Prussian Union in 1940 to reunite the preaching service and the celebration of the Holy Communion. When other churches and individual scholars associated themselves with this project, it was realized that a thoroughgoing study of the entire history and order of Christian worship was required. The text and the music of the proposed service were tested in actual use amid the ever increasing difficulties due to the war. After the war representatives of the Brotherhood of St. Michael joined the movement.

All connected with the project recognize it as a by-product of the renewed interest in Reformation theology and an expression of convictions matured in the common experiences of the Resistance Movement. The cardinal conviction which underlies this work is the belief that the heart of the church's life is to be found in the realization of the actual presence of Christ in the soul of the believer as mediated through the proclamation of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments. Disclaiming any attempt either at novelty or at mere repristination, the editors seek to renew the life of the church in Germany by restoring vital liturgical material and techniques in full accord with the example of the Reformers (especially the Lutheran Reformers) of the sixteenth century.

The title page names Joachim Beckmann, Peter Brunner, Hans Ludwig Kulp, and Walter Reindell as editors. The publisher's announcement identifies Dr. Beckmann as a member of the Supreme Council and president of the National Fraternal Council of the Confessing (*Bekennende*) Church. Dr. Brunner is a professor at the University of Marburg.

The plan of the *Agende,* as in the case of the Common Service, regards the complete service, including the Holy Communion, as the normal service for Sundays and Festivals. Provision is made, again as in the Common Service, for concluding the "Half-Mass" (when there is no Communion) with the prayer of the church, a hymn, and the benediction.

The opening chapter provides a body of general directions for the pastor, lector, cantor, choir, and congregation as well as for the proper arrangement of the altar, paraments, communion vessels, linens, etc. Exceptional situations, in which full resources are lacking as a result of conditions due to the war, are also cared for. In such cases the pastor may exercise the functions of the lector and even of the cantor. Similarly, where necessary, the cantor may substitute for the pastor in chanting parts of the service except in the case of the salutation, the Pax, and the benediction, which are specifically reserved for the minister. When chanting is impossible, ordinary speech is permitted.

It is to be noted that the *Agende* provides only for the service. It supplies this richly with the full series of historic Introits, Collects, Epistles, Graduals, and Gospels for every Sunday and Festival. This is a great advance over the partial restorations of the liturgy achieved by many German state churches at various times during the nineteenth century. The *Agende,* however, is definitely more limited in content than the Common Service in that it contains no orders for Matins and Vespers, no Psalms and Canticles, and gives only a small supplementary selection of collects and prayers. Forms are provided for so-called preaching services (without the Holy Communion) and for a service of public confession.

The calendar is almost identical with that in the Common Service Book. It in-

cludes Holy Innocents' Day (December 28), which is to be inserted in the new Common Liturgy of the American churches. A service in memory of the faithful departed is appointed for November 2 (All Souls' Day).

Two complete forms are provided for the ordinary of the service. The first is the simpler and presumably more usual form. The second, more elaborate in text and music, reflects the ecumenical spirit of the editors and contains several features from other than purely Germanic backgrounds.

The confession of sins in the first form is from Döber's Evangelical Mass of 1525. The text in the second form is an evangelical revision of the Confiteor of the pre-Reformation church, responsive in form.

The Gloria in Excelsis, which is omitted in Advent and from Septuagesima to Good Friday, is given completely in German translation. No provision is made for the abbreviated hymnal versification current in most German churches. The Creed, however, appears in simple versified form in the first service but with complete translation of the text in the second form. In the Apostles' Creed the *Agende* has anticipated the proposed American Common Liturgy in correcting (partially at least) the usual German mistranslation of the Latin word *catholicus* by inserting a proper equivalent: "eine heilige *allgemeine* christliche Kirche."

The prayer after the sermon is given its early title, *Oratio Fidelium*. The text in the first form is very similar to that of the Common Service. In the second form a lengthy text is given which follows the pattern of the ancient Deacon's Litany or Bidding Prayer, with bids by the lector and petitions by the minister. The second form also contains more elaborate musical settings for the Kyrie, Pax, Agnus Dei, and benediction. Six alternate post-Communion collects, appropriate for particular days or seasons, are appointed. This again is in line with what is proposed in the American Common Liturgy. Strangely enough, in a scholarly work of this general character, there is no attempt to restore the Eucharistic Prayer which has been reintroduced in the recent Indian and Swedish Lutheran liturgies and which is now proposed for the new American liturgy. The exhortation in the Order for Public Confession is a modern homily, quite inferior to the historic text in the Common Service which is a shortened form of the excellent *Vermahnung* in the early Restoration liturgies of Volprecht and Döber in Nuremberg, 1525.

The editors, with their evident information and attitude, might well have followed the example of the Swedish liturgy of 1940 and have given, as an alternate at least, the traditional Latin form of the plain song melodies for the Preface, Proper Prefaces, etc. These are richer, more flowing, and more beautiful than the simpler and harder melodic forms found in most German Church Orders and Cantionales.

It is remarkable that a book of this compass and excellent quality should have been produced amid the distractions and under the limitations imposed by war and post-war conditions. To have attained unity of purpose and plan among the cooperating groups and to have agreed upon a common text is in itself a remarkable achievement.

The publication, in attractive form and two colors, of a work as comprehensive as this must have involved considerable expense and risk. One can only hope that the labors bestowed upon this volume and its companion volumes will be rewarded by general appreciation and use of this fine new service book.

LUTHER D. REED

Pastoral Leadership. By Andrew Watterson Blackwood. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949. 272 pages. $3.00.

As the title suggests, this is a book dealing primarily with the pastor in relation to the lay leaders and workers of his

congregation. It is not a book on pastoral work or on pastoral counseling or on congregational management, though in a measure it has something to do with all of these. It is a book to help pastors, particularly young and inexperienced ones, and also students preparing for the pastorate, to work effectively with people, to develop workers, to encourage and guide officers and other leaders, and to handle successfully the numerous problems that confront a minister in a parish.

In scope it is quite comprehensive. Almost everything is discussed—from official boards to women's societies, from winning people for Christ to raising money, from developing community life to dancing in church parlors. Buildings and equipment, sextons and secretaries, choir directors and ushers, church schools and auxiliary organizations, committees and congregational meetings—all are treated, with emphasis on the human side.

In style it is popular. The reading is easy—nothing to puzzle over, nothing to struggle with, nothing to meditate on. Ideas, observations, suggestions, illuminated by brief case studies, flow in rapid succession. And in the main they are good, not infrequently excellent. A minimum of theory, a maximum of practice. It can be read in a few hours, with real profit.

There are, to this reviewer, little annoying things. For example, the pastor's wife is treated as though she were a sort of semi-pastor; the word "friend" is worn thin—everyone is a "friend": the ushers are the "friends" who seat people and receive the offering, the treasurer is the "friend" in charge of the treasury, and so on throughout the book; and there are many diverting sentences and parts of sentences: "The pastor may deal with the boys, and his wife with the girls, who average a year younger" (Why that last clause?) or "He may require each boy or girl to purchase a book that costs twenty cents" (Why twenty, why not fifteen or twenty-five?). But enough of this—perhaps more than enough. These annoyances are not serious enough to mar the readability or the value of the book. The author, through years of experience as pastor, as guest preacher in numberless congregations, and as professor of practical theology in touch with many hundreds of pastors in the various denominations, has given us a very helpful book in an area of the pastor's life where help has been greatly needed.

PAUL J. HOH

Memoirs of Childhood and Youth. By Albert Schweitzer. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949. 78 pages. $1.75.

Albert Schweitzer's account of his early years comes to American readers at a time when this giant personality has risen to a point of highest esteem for his learning, his art, and, most of all, his courageous and monumental work as an independent medical missionary in Africa.

This charming little book presents to the reader a vast number of facts and details of Schweitzer's life as a child, a boy, a student, a youth searching for life's meaning. But its greatest value lies in the light it throws on Schweitzer as an analyst of childhood, of boyhood, of youth. For although he is himself the object of his analysis, he reveals much that is important in the life of every normal child. It is remarkable how vividly he describes the smallest details of inner experience from points of view which he has outgrown long ago, and then draws lessons for universal application from his standpoint of maturity and Christian insight. Everywhere the book is full of human interest. It never becomes dull.

OTTO H. BOSTROM

Books Received

For the information of its readers and in acknowledgment to the publishers, THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY publishes the following list of books received. More extended notice will be given to as many of them as space permits.

Norah Lofts, *Women in the Old Testament.* New York: Macmillan Company, 1949. 178 pages. $2.50.

Gospel Parallels. A Synopsis of the First Three Gospels. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1949. 191 pages.

Charles D. Spotts, *You Can Read the Bible.* Philadelphia: Christian Education Press, 1949. 127 pages. $1.50.

H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Daniel.* Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1949. 549 pages. $5.00.

Anders Nygren, *Commentary on Romans.* Translated from the Swedish by Carl C. Rasmussen. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949. 457 pages. $5.00.

R. H. Preston and A. T. Hanson, *The Revelation of St. John the Divine.* (Torch Series.) New York: Macmillan Company, 1949. 145 pages. $2.25.

Thomas S. Kepler, ed., *Contemporary Thinking About Paul. An Anthology.* Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949. 442 pages. $4.00.

Chester W. Quimby, *The Great Redemption. A Living Commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Romans.* New York: Macmillan Company, 1950. 215 pages. $2.50.

Kenneth Clinton, *Let's Read the Bible.* New York: Macmillan Company, 1950. 149 pages. $2.00.

Hans Asmussen, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Epheser. Eine Herausforderung an die Macht.* Breklum: Christian Jensen Verlag, 1949. 136 pages. DM 7.20.

Maximilian Beyer, *Christ.* New York: Philosophical Library, 1949. 284 pages. $5.00.

By the Obedience of One. Pre-Lenten and Lenten Sermons by pastors of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1950. $2.75.

O. A. Geiseman, *Old Truths for a New Day.* Sermons on the Epistles of the First Half of the Church Year. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1949. 237 pages. $2.50.

Kyrka och Folksbildning. Studier tillägnade Torsten Bohlin. Stockholm: Sv. Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1949. 291 pages. Kr. 11:00.

Roger Hazelton, *Renewing the Mind.* New York: Macmillan Company, 1949. 192 pages. $2.50.

Georgia Harkness, *The Gospel and Our World.* Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1949. 126 pages. $1.50.

Rochard R. Caemmerer, *The Church in the World.* St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1949. 110 pages. $1.75.

Hans Asmussen, *Warum noch Lutherische Kirche? Ein Gespräch mit dem Augsburgischen Bekenntnis.* Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1949. 352 pages. DM 12.50.

Nils Karlström, *Ekumeniska Preludier. Nathan Söderbloms atveckling till internationell kyrkoledare.* Stockholm: Sv. Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1949. 119 pages. Kr. 5:00.

Harold B. Kildahl, Jr., *Thy Rod and Thy Staff.* Meditations based on Luther's Small Catechism. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1949. 386 pages. $1.75.

August G. Suechting, ed., *Thine Forever.* Daily Devotions following Luther's Small Catechism. Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1950. 383 pages. $1.75.

Edward Kuhlmann, *How Do You Do?* Columbus: Wartburg Press, 1949. 188 pages. $2.00.

Arvid Runestam, *Manniska och Kristen.* Stockholm: Sv. Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1949. 216 pages. Kr. 6:75.

Hermann Ullmann, *Der Weg des XIX. Jahrhunderts. Am Abgrund der Erstazreligionen.* München: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1949. 256 pages. DM 10:20.

CONTRIBUTORS

Stewart W. Herman, Geneva, Switzerland, is Director of the Resettlement Division of the Lutheran World Federation.

Ernst Benz is professor of Church history and history of dogma at the University of Marburg, Germany.

Jaroslav Pelikan is professor of systematic theology at Concordia Lutheran Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

C. Charles Bachmann is institutional chaplain in the Chicago area with the United Lutheran Social Mission Society of Illinois.

Gerard C. Hasenauer is a member of the faculty of Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa., in the department of Romance Languages.

Fredrik A. Schiotz is Executive Secretary of the Commission on Younger Churches and Orphaned Missions of the U. S. A. National Committee on the Lutheran World Federation.

R. H. Reinsche is pastor at Eustis, Neb.

J. Knudsen is president of Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa.

George H. Muedeking is a Lutheran pastor at Fullerton, Calif.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are Eric H. Wahlstrom, professor of the New Testament in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island; Charles M. Cooper, professor of the Old Testament in the Philadelphia Seminary; Harold L. Yochum, president of Capital University, Columbus; Alvin D. Mattson, professor of Ethics and Sociology in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island; Abdel Ross Wentz, president of the Gettysburg Seminary; P. H. Buehring, professor of Church History in the Capital University Seminary, Columbus; John Kuethe, pastor of a congregation at Odessa, Texas; Jacob A. Dell, professor of Practical Theology in the Capital University; Harry F. Baughman, professor of Homiletics in the Gettysburg Seminary; R. D. Lechleitner, executive secretary of the A.L.C. Board of Home Missions, Columbus, Ohio; Harvey D. Hoover, professor of Practical Theology in the Gettysburg Seminary; E. W. Matzner, professor of Systematic Theology in Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque; George R. Seltzer, professor of Liturgics in the Philadelphia Seminary; E. E. Flack, dean of Hamma Divinity School; C. Umhau Wolf, professor of the Old Testament in the Chicago Seminary, Maywood, Illinois; Luther D. Reed, emeritus professor of Liturgics in the Philadelphia Seminary; Paul J. Hoh, president of the Philadelphia Seminary; Otto H. Bostrom, professor of English Bible in Hamma Divinity School; Raymond T. Stamm, professor of the New Testament in the Gettysburg Seminary; Albert A. Jagnow, professor of Church History in Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque; J. M. Myers, professor of the Old Testament in the Gettysburg Seminary.